

Government and people to put a stop to the unlawful aggressions of Poland against Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Letter from Robert Bedgood and the Tighner Gold Mining Co., San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the return to the war-time practice of licensing miners who have the handling of powder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letter from the Newport Branch, No. 7, National Association of United States Civil Service Employees of Navy Yards and Stations, inclosing a copy of petition sent to the Secretary of the Navy, requesting an increase of 40 per cent in the salary of the clerical employees; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the Strauss Market (Inc.) and others, of New York City, favoring the cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of MacArthur Bros. Co., of New York, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 2896; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of P. A. Garraby, of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 2; to the Committee on Pensions.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, October 2, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in our great interest for the welfare of the people of this country, we are not so much disturbed by honest differences of opinion as we are anxious that every leader of men and every force that goes to make public opinion is right with Thee. For Thou art the judge of mankind. Our welfare and our destiny are in Thy hands. Keep us safely from every evil way. Guide us in the way of truth. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINS) took the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### LANDING OF MARINES IN DALMATIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, which will lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, October 1, 1919.

MY DEAR SIR: Responding to a resolution of the Senate, "requesting information as to whether American marines were landed from a torpedo-boat destroyer or any other naval vessel to compel Italians to evacuate Trau, Dalmatia, as reported in a dispatch by the Associated Press published in the Washington Post of September 26, 1919." I have the honor to transmit the following cable from Rear Admiral Harry S. Knapp, commanding United States naval forces operating in European waters, giving the information desired:

"To the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, D. C.:

"The armistice line extends from Cape Planka inland, north and west of this line Italian troops in occupation, south and east of the line garrisoned by Serbian troops. This latter section Dalmatian coast headquarters American naval forces, in which by agreement after armistice American naval forces took charge of all one-time Austrian-Hungarian vessels found there, and which has since been generally called American zone. Americans have no troops on shore, but have extended a strong moral influence for the preservation of order and avoidance of clash between Italian and Jugo-Slavs. There has been considerable friction along armistice line between Serbians and Italians, but by the tactful firmness of American admiral there it has been kept from causing serious results. On September 23 three truck loads of Italian soldiers in command of an Italian Army captain crossed armistice line from Italian zone and surprised and captured the small Serbian garrison at Trau. The Italian authorities informed the senior American officer present, Capt. Boyd, that the move was unwarranted and asked that the raiders be turned back. Boyd sent a destroyer and two chasers to Trau at once, then saw the Serbian commander and got him to agree not to order an advance until he had an opportunity to get Italians to withdraw. He sent Lieut. Commander R. S. Fields and Commander Marony, of the Italian ship *Puglia*, by automobile to Trau, and himself went in U. S. S. *Olympia* to Trau. On arrival he found that Italians had been induced to return, leaving, however, Italian Army captain and three soldiers owing to breakdown of a truck. He landed a small guard from U. S. S. *Cocell* and U. S. S. *Olympia* to see no harm done Italians and preserve order pending arrival of Serbian troops. He put the Italian Army captain and three soldiers on an Italian motor boat and turned them over in charge an Italian naval officer. Upon arrival of the Serbian troops he withdrew blue jackets after first receiving assurance that no violence would be offered to civilians.

"Italian Admiral Milo in command of ships and troops in Italian zone of occupation sent senior Italian officer present at Spalato to U. S. S. *Olympia* with thanks for sending Trau raiders back. He has brought the officer commander of the raiding force to trial by court-martial. The whole affair was most creditably handled, and the

prompt action of Capt. Boyd, in my opinion, undoubtedly prevented a very serious incident which might have resulted in open warfare between Italians and Serbians. The landing was the protection of the offending Italians left in Trau until adequate Serbian forces could arrive to preserve order.

"The fact that Italian authority requested action of Capt. Boyd and that he was thanked by Admiral Milo for his action, and that Admiral Milo has brought offending Italian officer to trial by court-martial all go to show that the raid was an isolated act of hotheads done in defiance of Italian authority, and that America acted in co-operation with Italians to restore situation. That no serious result happened is due to the prompt and efficient action of American forces. Had they not so acted there would almost inevitably have been bloodshed, which would perhaps have resulted in a state of actual war between Italy and Jugo-Slavia owing to the intensity of feeling existing over the Dalmatian question."

I have the honor to be,  
Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7015. An act providing that the Panama Canal rules shall govern in the measurement of vessels for imposing tolls; and

H. R. 9521. An act to prevent hoarding and deterioration of, and deception with respect to, cold-storage foods; to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce; and for other purposes.

### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 7015. An act providing that the Panama Canal rules shall govern in the measurement of vessels for imposing tolls was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

H. R. 9521. An act to prevent hoarding and deterioration of, and deception with respect to, cold-storage foods; to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BECKHAM. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry bankers of Lebanon, Ky., with reference to the peace treaty and league of nations, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEBANON, KY., October 1, 1919.

Hon. J. C. W. BECKHAM,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly request the Senate to approve the peace treaty and the league of nations without reservation or amendment.

W. C. Rogers (president), O. D. Thomas (cashier), Marion National Bank; R. E. Young (president), J. A. Kelly (cashier), Citizens' National Bank; R. C. McChord (president), F. L. Dant (cashier), Farmers' National Bank.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Engineers' Club of Duluth, Minn., praying for the reorganization and enlargement of the United States Patent Office and for its separation from the Department of the Interior, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of the Engineers' Club of Duluth, Minn., praying for the passage of the pending water-power bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of sundry button workers of Newport, Ark., and a petition of sundry button workers of Devall Bluff, Ark., praying for the placing of a tax on foreign-made buttons, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented a petition of Croswell Grange, No. 1006, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sanilac County, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of Boyne City, Mich., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the International Y. M. C. A., of Springfield, Mass., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Bible Class of the Church of Christ, of Windsor, Conn., praying that immediate and adequate steps be taken to help Armenia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Elm Lodge, No. 420, International Association of Machinists, of New Haven, Conn., praying that the State Department urge that Great Britain extend to Americans in England the same protection to their person

and property that is demanded of Russia and Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Lithuanian Dramatic Society of Waterbury, Conn., praying for the independence of Lithuania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of East Windsor, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty without delay, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Meriden, Conn., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry postal clerks of Kalamazoo, Mich., and a petition of sundry postal clerks of Washington, N. C., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of St. Mary's Commandery, No. 69, of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 39, of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for Federal control of the food supply and distribution of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### STEEL STRIKE INVESTIGATION.

Mr. CALDER. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 202, submitted yesterday by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], to report it back favorably without amendment. The Senator from Iowa, chairman of the committee investigating the steel strike, is anxious that the resolution may be acted upon this morning, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof, having been heretofore directed to investigate the steel strike, is hereby empowered to sit and act at such time and place as it may deem necessary; to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses, the production of books, papers, and documents; to employ stenographers at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses. Subpoenas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee thereof. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer all questions pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The expense thereof shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate on vouchers ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

HELEN E. SULLIVAN.

Mr. CALDER. I report from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate the following resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 201, submitted yesterday by Mr. CURTIS, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate to Helen E. Sullivan, sister of Jeremiah Sullivan, late a laborer in the heating and ventilating department of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution just read. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to inquire, What is the basis of the resolution, and why this appropriation is to be made?

Mr. CURTIS. It is the usual resolution that is passed when an employee of the Senate dies.

Mr. THOMAS. That is sufficient.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3141) for the relief of Second Lieut. Rollin Lester Dixon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 3142) authorizing the sale, exchange, lease, and bailment of war supplies and other Government property; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3143) to equalize the wages paid to men and women employees of the Government who perform similar labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 3144) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," approved September 26, 1914; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 3145) releasing the claim of the United States Government to the block or square of land in the city of Fort Smith, in the State of Arkansas, upon which is situated the old Federal jail, to the city of Fort Smith as a site for a convention hall, community building, and other public purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 3146) granting a pension to Mary F. McBride;

A bill (S. 3147) granting an increase of pension to Abram P. Francisco; and

A bill (S. 3148) granting an increase of pension to William W. Poor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3149) granting a pension to Charles Shanley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 3150) granting a pension to Johanna Mary McElliot (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION.

Mr. COLT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 204), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Immigration, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-sixth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost of not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

#### LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that it is my intention to address the Senate to-morrow, Friday, on the pending peace treaty after the conclusion of the address of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR TO-DAY.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I notice by the RECORD that yesterday afternoon, immediately before adjournment, a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into to vote on the Fall amendments to-day, and limiting debate after 2 o'clock to five minutes on each amendment. I merely want to say that if I had been present I would have objected to the agreement. I was in my office, within call of the Senate, and I would have responded had there been a call for a quorum, and thus been given an opportunity to make my objection.

I understand that under the rule a quorum is not required to reach an agreement except upon bills and joint resolutions; but be that as it may, Mr. President, it seems to me that if there is one reason why we can not reach a unanimous-consent agreement to build a bridge across a river or a creek without a call for a quorum, there are a thousand reasons why the consideration of this treaty, involving us as it does in all sorts of complications with the world, should be within the spirit of such a rule. I think it was a lack of consideration for Senators who were absent and who are interested in reaching a wise conclusion in respect to the treaty not to call for a quorum. It should have been called out of courtesy.

I regard these amendments as raising most important questions. I doubt whether there are many Senators who even know what the commissions are or what powers and duties are imposed upon the members of the commissions.

In my opinion, Mr. President, full discussion, a discussion which, in respect to some amendments, arguments could be advanced that have no relation to others, but a full discussion would present the best means of giving the Senate and the public full information on what we are getting into. If we get into these commissions with all their involvement, the country is pulling at the whiskers of death.



## SPEECHES OF PRESIDENT WILSON.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask that the speeches of the President delivered on September 15, 17, 18, and 19 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses of the President were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT AT ARENA, SEATTLE, WASH., SEPTEMBER 13, 1919.

"Mr. Chairman, my fellow countrymen, I esteem it a privilege to have the occasion to stand before this great audience and expound some part of the great question that is now holding the attention of America and the attention of the world. I was led to an unpleasant consciousness to-day of the way in which the debate that is going on in America has attracted the attention of the world. I read in to-day's papers the comments of one of the men who were recently connected with the Imperial Government of Germany. He said that some aspects of this debate seemed to him like the red that precedes a great dawn. He saw in it the rise of a certain renewed sympathy with Germany. He saw in it an opportunity to separate America from the Governments and peoples with whom she had been associated in the war against German aggression. And all over this country, my fellow citizens, it is becoming more and more evident that those who were the partisans of Germany are the ones who are principally pleased by some of the aspects of the debate that is now going on. The world outside of America is asking itself the question, 'Is America going to stand by us now, or is it at this moment of final crisis going to draw apart and desert us?' I can answer that question here and now. It is not going to draw apart and it is not going to desert the nations of the world. America responds to nothing so quickly or unanimously as a great moral challenge. It is much more ready to carry through what now lies before it than it was even to carry through what was before it when we took up arms in behalf of the freedom of the world. America is unaccustomed to military tasks, but America is accustomed to fulfilling its pledges and following its visions. The only thing that causes me uneasiness, my fellow countrymen, is not the ultimate outcome, but the impressions that may be created in the meantime by the perplexed delay. The rest of the world believed absolutely in America and was ready to follow it anywhere, and it is now a little chilled. It now asks, 'Is America hesitating to lead? We are ready to give ourselves to her leadership. Why will she not accept the gift?'

"My fellow citizens, I think that it is my duty as I go about the country, not to make speeches in the ordinary acceptance of that word, not to appeal either to the imagination or to the emotion of my fellow citizens, but to undertake everywhere what I want to undertake to-night, and I must ask you to be patient while I undertake it. I want to analyze for you what it is that it is proposed we should do. Generalities will not penetrate to the heart of this great question. It is not enough to speak of the general purposes of the peace. I want you to realize just what the covenant of the league of nations means. I find that everywhere I go it is desirable that I should dwell upon this great theme, because in so many parts of the country men are drawing attention to little details in a way that destroys the whole perspective of the great plan in a way that concentrates attention upon certain particulars which are incidental and not central. I am going to take the liberty of reading you a list of the things which the nations adhering to the covenant of the league of nations undertake. I want to say by way of preface that it seems to me, and I am sure it will seem to you, not only an extraordinarily impressive list, but a list which was never proposed for the counsels of the world before.

"In the first place, every nation that joins the league, and that in prospect means every great fighting nation in the world, agrees to submit all controversies which are likely to lead to war either to arbitration or to thorough discussion by an authoritative body, the council of the league of nations. These great nations, all the most ambitious nations in the world except Germany, all the most powerful nations in the world, as well as the weak ones—all the nations that we have supposed had imperialistic designs—say that they will do either one or the other of two things in case a controversy arises which can not be settled by ordinary diplomatic correspondence: They will either frankly submit it to arbitration and absolutely abide by the arbitral verdict or they will submit all the facts, all the documents, to the council of the league of nations, will give the council six months in which to discuss the whole matter and leave to publish the whole matter, and at the end of the six months will still refrain for three months more from going to war, whether they like the opinion of the council or not. In other words, they agree to do a thing which would have made

the recent war with Germany absolutely impossible. If there had been a league of nations in 1914, whether Germany belonged to it or not, Germany never would have dared to attempt the aggression which she did attempt, because she would have been called to the bar of the opinion of mankind and would have known that if she did not satisfy that opinion mankind would unite against her. You had only to expose the German case to public discussion and make it certain that the German case would fall. Germany would not dare attempt to act upon it. It was the universal opinion on the other side of the water when I was over there that if Germany had thought that England would be added to France and Russia she never would have gone in, and if she had dreamed that America would throw her mighty weight into the scale it would have been inconceivable. The only thing that reassured the deluded German people after we entered the war was the lying statement of her public men that we could not get our troops across the sea, because Germany knew if America got within striking distance the story was done. Here all the nations of the world, except Germany, for the time being at any rate, give notice that they will unite against any nation that has a bad case, and they agree that in their own case they will submit to prolonged discussion.

"There is nothing so chilling as discussion to a hot temper. If you are fighting mad and yet I can induce you to talk it over for half an hour, you will not be fighting mad at the end of the half hour. I knew a very wise schoolmaster in North Carolina who said that if any boy in that school fought another except according to the rules he would be expelled. There would not be any great investigation; the fact that he had fought would be enough; he would go home; but if he was so mad that he had to fight, all he had to do was to come to the head master and tell him that he wanted to fight. The head master would arrange the ring, would see that the fight was conducted according to the Marquis of Queensberry rules, that an umpire and a referee were appointed, and that the thing was fought to a finish. The consequence was that there were no fights in that school. The whole arrangement was too cold-blooded. By the time all the arrangements had been made all the fighting audacity had gone out of the contestants. That little thing illustrates a great thing. Discussion is destructive when wrong is intended; and all the nations of the world agree to put their case before the judgment of mankind. Why, my fellow citizens, that has been the dream of thoughtful reformers for generation after generation. Somebody seems to have conceived the notion that I originated the idea of a league of nations. I wish I had. I would be a very proud man if I had; but I did not. I was expressing the avowed aspirations of the American people, avowed by nobody so loudly, so intelligently, or so constantly as the greater leaders of the Republican Party. When Republicans take that road, I take off my hat and follow; I do not care whether I lead or not. I want the great result which I know is at the heart of the people that I am trying to serve.

"In the second place, all these great nations agree to boycott any nation that does not submit a perilous question either to arbitration or to discussion, and to support each other in the boycott. There is no 'if' or 'but' about that in the covenant. It is agreed that just so soon as that member State, or any outside State, for that matter, refuses to submit its case to the public opinion of the world its doors will be closed and locked; that nobody shall trade with it, no telegraphic message shall leave it or enter it, no letter shall cross its borders either way; there shall be no transactions of any kind between the citizens of the members of the league and the covenant-breaking State. That is the remedy that thoughtful men have advocated for several generations. They have thought, and thought truly, that war was barbarous and that a nation that resorted to war when its cause was unjust was unworthy of being consorted with by free people anywhere. The boycott is an infinitely more terrible instrument of war. Excepting our own singularly fortunate country, I can not think of any other country that can live upon its own resources. The minute you lock the door, then the pinch of the thing becomes intolerable; not only the physical pinch, not only the fact that you can not get raw materials and must stop your factories, not only the fact that you can not get food and your people must begin to starve, not only the fact that your credit is stopped, that your assets are useless, but the still greater pinch that comes when a nation knows that it is sent to Coventry and despised. To be put in jail is not the most terrible punishment that happens to a condemned man; if he knows that he was justly condemned, what penetrates his heart is the look in other men's eyes. It is the soul that is wounded much more poignantly than the body, and one of the things that the German nation has not been able to comprehend is that it has lost for the time being the respect of man-



kind; and as Germans, when the doors of truth were opened to them after the war, have begun to realize that they have begun to look aghast at the probable fortunes of Germany, for if the world does not trust them, if the world does not respect them, if the world does not want Germans to come as immigrants any more, what is Germany to do? Germany's worst punishment, my fellow citizens, is not in the treaty; it is in her relations with the rest of mankind for the next generation. The boycott is what is substituted for war.

"In the third place, all the members of this great association pledge themselves to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other member States. That is the famous article 10 that you hear so much about; and article 10, my fellow citizens, whether you want to assume the responsibility of it or not, is the heart of the pledge that we have made to the other nations of the world. Only by that article can we be said to have underwritten civilization. The wars that threaten mankind begin by that kind of aggression. For every other nation than Germany, in 1914, treaties stood as solemn and respected covenants. For Germany they were scraps of paper; and when her first soldier's foot fell upon the soil of Belgium her honor was forfeited. That act of aggression, that failure to respect the territorial integrity of a nation whose territory she was specially bound to respect, pointed the hand along that road that is strewn with graves since the beginning of history, that road made red and ugly with the strife of men, the strife behind which lies savage cupidity, the strife behind which lies a disregard for the rights of others and a thought concentrated upon what you want and mean to get. That is the heart of war, and unless you accept article 10 you do not cut the heart of war out of civilization.

"Belgium did not hesitate to underwrite civilization. Belgium could have had safety on her own terms if only she had not resisted the German arms—little Belgium, helpless Belgium, ravaged Belgium. Ah, my fellow citizens, I have seen some of the fields of Belgium. I rode with her fine, democratic King over some of those fields. He would say to me, 'This is the village of so and so,' and there was no village there, just scattered stones all over the plain, and the plain dug deep every few feet with the holes made by exploding shells. You could not tell whether it was the earth thrown up or the house thrown down that made the debris which covered the desert made by the war. Then we rode farther in, farther to the east, where there had been no fighting, no active campaigning, and there we saw beautiful green slopes and fields that had once been cultivated, and towns with their factories standing, but standing empty; not empty of workers merely, empty of machinery. Every piece of machinery in Belgium that they could put on freight cars the Germans had taken away, and what they could not carry with them they had destroyed, under the devilishly intelligent direction of experts—great bodies of heavy machinery that never could be used again, because somebody had known where the heart of the machine lay and where to put the dynamite. The Belgians are there, their buildings are there, but nothing to work with, nothing to start life with again; and in the face of all that Belgium did not flinch for a moment to underwrite the interests of mankind by saying to Germany, 'We will not be bought.'

"Italy could have had more by compounding with Austria in the later stages of the war than she is going to get out of the peace settlement now, but she would not compound. She also was a trustee for civilization, and she would not sell the birthright of mankind for any sort of material advantage. She underwrote civilization. And Serbia, the first of the helpless nations to be struck down, her armies driven from her own soil, maintained her armies on other soil, and the armies of Serbia were never dispersed. Whether they could be on their own soil or not, they were fighting for their rights and through their rights for the rights of civilized man.

"I believe that America is going to be more willing than any other nation in the world, when it gets its voice heard, to do the same thing that these little nations did. Why, my fellow citizens, we have been talking constantly about the rights of little nations. There is only one way to maintain the rights of little nations, and that is by the strength of great nations. Having begun this great task, we are no quitters; we are going to see the thing through. The red that this German counsellor of state saw upon the horizon was not the red of any dawn that will reassure the people who attempted the wrong that Germany did. It was the first red glare of the fire that is going to consume the wrong in the world. As that moral fire comes creeping on, it is going to purify every field of blood upon which free men sacrificed their lives; it is going to redeem France, redeem Belgium, redeem devastated Serbia, redeem the fair lands in

the north of Italy, and set men on their feet again, to look fate in the face and have again that hope which is the only thing that leads men forward.

"In the next place, every nation agrees to join in advising what shall be done in case any one of the members fails to keep that promise. There is where you have been misled, my fellow citizens. You have been led to believe that the council of the league of nations could say to the Congress of the United States, 'Here is a war, and here is where you come in.' Nothing of the sort is true. The council of the league of nations is to advise what is to be done, and I have not been able to find in the dictionary any meaning of the word 'advise,' except 'to advise.' But let us suppose that it means something else; let us suppose that there is some legal compulsion behind the advice. The advice can not be given except by a unanimous vote of the council and an affirmative vote of the United States. We will be a permanent member of the council of the league of nations, and no such advice is ever going to be given unless the United States votes 'aye,' with one exception. If we are parties to the dispute, we can not vote; but, my fellow citizens, let me remind you that if we are parties to the dispute, we are in the war anyhow, so that we are not forced into war by the vote of the council, we are forced into war by our quarrel with the other party, as we would be in any case. There is no sacrifice in the slightest degree of the independent choice of the Congress of the United States whether it will declare war or not. There is a peculiar impression on the part of some persons in this country that the United States is more jealous of its sovereignty than other countries. That provision was not put in there because it was necessary to safeguard the sovereignty of the United States. All the other nations wanted it, and they were just as keen for their veto as we were keen for our veto. There is not the slightest danger that they will misunderstand that article of the covenant. There is only a danger that some of us who are too credulous will be led to misunderstand it.

"All the nations agree to join in devising a plan for general disarmament. You have heard that this covenant was a plan for bringing on war. Well, it is going to bring on war by means of disarmament and also by establishing a permanent court of international justice. When I voted for that, I was obeying the mandate of the Congress of the United States. In a very unexpected place, namely, in a naval appropriation bill passed in 1915, it was declared to be the policy of the United States to bring about a general disarmament by common agreement, and the President of the United States was requested to call a conference not later than the close of the then present war for the purpose of consulting and agreeing upon a plan for a permanent court of international justice; and he was authorized, in case such an agreement could be reached, to stop the building program provided for by that naval appropriation bill. The Congress of the United States deliberately not only accepted but directed the President to promote an agreement of this sort for disarmament and a permanent court of international justice. You know what a permanent court of international justice implies. You can not set up a court without respecting its decrees. You can not make a toy of it. You can not make a mockery of it. If you, indeed, want a court, then you must abide by the judgments of the court. And we have declared already that we are willing to abide by the judgments of a court of international justice.

"All the nations agree to register every treaty, and they agree that no treaty that is not registered and published shall be valid. All private agreements and secret treaties are swept from the table, and thereby one of the most dangerous instruments of international intrigue and disturbance is abolished.

"They agree to join in the supervision of the government of helpless and dependent people. They agree that no nation shall hereafter have the right to annex any territory merely because the people that live on it can not prevent it, and that instead of annexation there shall be trusteeship, under which these territories shall be administered under the supervision of the associated nations of the world. They lay down rules for the protection of dependent peoples of that sort, so that they shall not have enforced labor put upon them, so that their women and children shall be protected from unwholesome and destructive forms of labor, so that they will be kept away from the opium traffic and the traffic in arms. They agree that they will never levy armies there. They agree, in other words, to do what no nation ever agreed to do before—to treat subject nations like human beings.

"They agree also to accord and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children born in their own countries and in all other countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose they agree to join in establishing and maintaining the necessary in-



ternational organization. This great treaty, which we are hesitating to ratify, contains the organization by which the united counsels of mankind shall attempt to lift the levels of labor and see that men who are working with their hands are everywhere treated as they ought to be treated, upon principles of justice and equality. How many laboring men dreamed, when this war began, that four years later it would be possible for all the great nations of the world to enter into a covenant like that? They agree to intrust the league with the general supervision of all international agreements with regard to traffic in women and children and traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs. They agree to intrust the league with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest. They agree to join in making provision to secure and maintain freedom of communication and of transit and equitable treatment for commerce in respect of all the members of the league. They agree to cooperate in the endeavor to take steps for the prevention and control of disease. They agree to encourage and promote the establishment and cooperation of duly authorized voluntary national Red Cross organizations for the improvement of health, the prevention of disease, and the mitigation of suffering throughout the world.

"I ask you, my fellow citizens, is that not a great peace document and a great human document? And is it conceivable that America, the most progressive and humane nation in the world, should refuse to take the same responsibility upon herself that all the other great nations take in supporting this great covenant? You say, 'It is not likely that the treaty will be rejected. It is only likely that there will be certain reservations.' Very well, I want very frankly to tell you what I think about that. If the reservations do not change the treaty, then it is not necessary to make them part of the resolution of ratification. If all that you desire is to say what you understand the treaty to mean, no harm can be done by saying it; but if you want to change the treaty, if you want to alter the phraseology so that the meaning is altered, if you want to put in reservations which give the United States a position of special privilege or a special exemption from responsibility among the members of the league, then it will be necessary to take the treaty back to the conference table, and, my fellow citizens, the world is not in a temper to discuss this treaty over again. The world is just now more profoundly disturbed about social and economic conditions than it ever was before, and the world demands that we shall come to some sort of settlement which will let us get down to business and purify and rectify our own affairs. This is not only the best treaty that can be obtained, but I want to say, because I played only a small part in framing it, that it is a sound and good treaty, and America, above all nations, should not be the nation that puts obstacles in the way of the peace of nations and the peace of mind of the world.

"The world has not anywhere at this moment, my fellow citizens, peace of mind. Nothing has struck me so much in recent months as the unaccustomed anxiety on the face of people. I am aware that men do not know what is going to happen, and that they know that it is just as important to them what happens in the rest of the world, almost, as what happens in America. America has connections with all the rest of the world not only, but she has necessary dealings with all the rest of the world, and no man is fatuous enough to suppose that if the rest of the world is disturbed and disordered, the disturbance and disorder are not going to extend to the United States. The center of our anxiety, my fellow citizens, is in that pitiful country to which our hearts go out, that great mass of mankind whom we call the Russians. I have never had the good fortune to be in Russia, but I know many persons who know that lovable people intimately, and they all tell me that there is not a people in the world more generous, more simple, more kindly, more naturally addicted to friendship, more patiently attached to peace than the Russian people. Yet, after throwing off the grip of terror that an autocratic power of the Czar had upon them, they have come under a terror even greater than that; they have come under the terror of the power of men whom nobody knows how to find. One or two names everybody knows, but the rest is intrigue, terror, informing, spying, and military power, the seizure of all the food obtainable in order that the fighting men may be fed and the rest go starved. These men have been appealed to again and again by the civilized Governments of the world to call a constituent assembly, let the Russian people say what sort of government they want to have; and they will not, they dare not, do it. That picture is before the eyes of every nation. Shall we get into the clutch of another sort of minority? My fellow citizens, I am going to devote every influence I have and all the authority I have from this time on to see to it that no minority commands the United States.

[Great and continued applause.] It heartens me, but it does not surprise me, to know that that is the verdict of every man and woman here; but, my fellow citizens, there is no use passing that verdict unless we are going to take part, and a great part, a leading part, in steadying the counsels of the world. Not that we are afraid of anything except the spread of moral defection, and moral defection can not come except where men have lost faith, lost hope, have lost confidence; and, having seen the attitude of the other peoples of the world toward America, I know that the whole world will lose heart unless America consents to show the way.

"It was pitiful, on the other side of the sea, to have delegation after delegation from peoples all over the world come to the house I was living in in Paris and seek conference with me to beg that America would show the way. It was touching. It made me very proud, but it made me very sad; proud that I was the representative of a nation so regarded, but very sad to feel how little of all the things that they had dreamed we could accomplish for them. But we can accomplish this, my fellow citizens: We can, having taken a pledge to be faithful to them, redeem the pledge. We shall redeem the pledge. I look forward to the day when all this debate will seem in our recollection like a strange mist that came over the minds of men here and there in the Nation, like a groping in the fog, having lost the way, the plain way, the beaten way, that America had made for itself for generations together; and we shall then know that of a sudden, upon the assertion of the real spirit of the American people, they came to the edge of the mist, and outside lay the sunny country where every question of duty lay plain and clear and where the great tramp, tramp of the American people sounded in the ears of the whole world, which knew that the armies of God were on their way."

THE PRESIDENT, AT LUNCHEON, HOTEL PORTLAND, PORTLAND, OREG.,  
SEPTEMBER 15, 1919.

"Mr. Jackson, ladies, and gentlemen, as I return to Portland I can not help remembering that I learned a great deal in Oregon. When I was a teacher I used to prove to my own satisfaction—I do not know whether it was to the satisfaction of my classes or not—that the initiative and referendum would not work. I came to Oregon to find that they did work, and have since been apologizing for my earlier opinion. Because I have always taken this attitude toward facts, that I never let them get me if I see them coming first. There is nothing I respect so much as a fact. There is nothing that is so formidable as a fact, and the real difficulty in all political reform is to know whether you can translate your theories into facts or not, whether you can safely pick out the operative ideas and leave aside the inoperative ideas. For I think you will all agree with me that the whole progress of human affairs is the progress of ideas; not of ideas in the abstract form, but of ideas in the operative form, certain conceptions of justice and of freedom and of right that have got into men's natures and led those natures to insist upon the realization of those ideas in experience and in action.

"The whole trouble about our civilization, as it looks to me, is that it has grown complex faster than we have adjusted the simpler ideas to the existing conditions. There was a time when men would do in their business what they would not do as individuals. There was a time when they submerged their individual consciences in a corporation and persuaded themselves that it was legitimate for a corporation to do what they individually never would have dreamed of doing. That is what I mean by saying that the organization becomes complex faster than our adjustment of the simpler ideas of justice and right to the developing circumstances of our civilization. I say that because the errand that I am on concerns something that lies at the heart of all progress. I think we are all now convinced that we have not reached the right and final organization of our industrial society; that there are many features of our social life that ought to undergo correction; that while we call ourselves democrats—with a little 'd'—while we believe in democratic government, we have not seen yet the successful way of making our life in fact democratic; that we have allowed classes to disclose themselves; that we have allowed lines of cleavage to be run through our community, so that there are antagonisms set up that breed heat, because they breed friction. The world must have leisure and order in which to see that these things are set right, and the world can not have leisure and order unless it has a guaranteed peace.

"For example, if the United States should conceivably—I think it inconceivable—stay out of the league of nations, it would stay out at this cost: We would have to see, since we were not going to join our force with other nations, that our force was formidable enough to be respected by other nations. We



would have to maintain a great army and a great navy. We would have to do something more than that: We would have to concentrate authority sufficiently to be able to use the physical force of the Nation quickly upon occasion. All of that is absolutely antidemocratic in its influence. All of that means that we should not be giving ourselves the leisure of thought or the release of material resources necessary to work out our own methods of civilization, our own methods of industrial organization and production and distribution; and our problems are exactly the problems of the rest of the world. I am more and more convinced, as I come in contact with the men who are trying to think for other countries as we are trying to think for this one, that our problems are identical, only there is this difference: Peoples of other countries have lost confidence in their Governments. Some of them have lost confidence in their form of government. That point, I hope and believe, has not been reached in the United States. We have not lost confidence in our Government. I am not now speaking of our administration; I am now thinking of our method of government. We believe that we can manage our own affairs and that we have the machinery through which we can manage our own affairs, and that no clique or special interest is powerful enough to run away with it. The other countries of the world also believe that about us. They believe that we are successfully organized for justice, and they therefore want us to take the lead and they want to follow the lead. If we do not take the lead, then we throw them back upon things in which they have no confidence and endanger a universal disorder and discontent in the midst of which it will be impossible to govern our own affairs with success and with constant achievement. Whether you will or not, our fortunes are tied in with the rest of the world, and the choice that we have to make now is whether we will receive the influences of the rest of the world and be affected by them or dominate the influences of the world and lead them. That is a tremendous choice to make, but it is exactly that tremendous choice that we have to make, and I deeply regret the suggestions which are made on some sides that we should take advantage of the present situation in the world but should not shoulder any of the responsibility. Do you know of any business or undertaking in which you can get the advantage without assuming the responsibility? What are you going to be? Boys running around the circus tent and peeping under the canvas? Men declining to pay the admission and sitting on the roof and looking on the game? Or are you going to play your responsible part in the game, knowing that you are trusted as leader and umpire both?

"Nothing has impressed me more, or impressed me more painfully, if I may say so, than the degree in which the rest of the world trusts us and looks to us. I say 'painfully' because I am conscious that they are expecting more than we can perform. They are expecting miracles to be wrought by the influence of the American spirit on the affairs of the world, and miracles can not be wrought. I have again and again recited to my fellow citizens on this journey how depositions from peoples of every kind and every color and every fortune, from all over the world, thronged to the house in which I was living in Paris to ask the guidance and assistance of the United States. They did not send similar delegations to anybody else, and they did not send them to me except because they thought they had heard in what I had been saying the spirit of the American people uttered. Moreover, you must not forget this; that almost all of them had kinsmen in America. You must not forget that America is made up out of all the world and that there is hardly a race of any influence in the world, at any rate hardly a Caucasian race, that has not scores and hundreds, and sometimes millions, of people living in America with whom they are in correspondence, from whom they receive the subtle suggestions of what is going on in American life, and of the ideals of American life. Therefore they feel that they know America from this contact they have had with us, and they want America to be the leading force in the world. Why, I received delegations there speaking tongues that I did not know anything about. I did not know what family of languages they belonged to, but fortunately for me they always brought an interpreter along who could speak English, and one of the significant facts was that the interpreter was almost always some young man who had lived in America. He did not talk English to me; he talked American to me. So there always seemed to be a little link of some sort tying them up with us, tying them up with us in fact, in relationship, in blood, as well as in life, and the world will be turned back to cynicism if America goes back on it.

"We dare not go back on it. I ask you even as a business proposition whether it is more useful to trade with a cynic or with an optimist. I do not like to trade with a man with a grouch. I do not like to trade with a man who begins by not believing anything I am telling him. I like to trade with a man

who is more or less susceptible to the eloquence which I address to him. A salesman has a much longer job if he approaches a grouch than if he approaches a friend. This trivial illustration illustrates, my fellow citizens, our relation to the rest of the world. If we do not do what the rest of the world expects of us, all the rest of the world will have a grouch toward America, and you will find it a hard job to reestablish your credit in the world. And back of financial credit lies mental credit. There is not a bit of credit that has not got an element of assessment of character. You do not limit your credit to men who can put up the collateral, who have the assets; you extend it also to the men in whose characters and abilities you believe; you think they are going to make good. Your credit is a sort of bet on their capacity, and that is the largest element in the kind of credit that expands enterprise. The credit that merely continues enterprise is based upon asset and past accomplishment, but the credit that expands enterprise is based upon your assessment of character. If you are going to put into the world this germ, I shall call it, of American enterprise and American faith and American vision, then you must be the principal partners in the new partnership which the world is forming.

"I take leave to say, without intending the least disrespect to anybody, that, consciously or unconsciously, a man who opposes that proposition either has no imagination or no knowledge, or is a quitter. America has put her hand to this great enterprise already, in the men she sent overseas, and their part was the negative part merely. They were sent over there to see that a malign influence did not interfere with the just fortunes of the world. They stopped that influence, but they did not accomplish anything constructive, and what is the use clearing the table if you are going to put nothing on it? What is the use clearing the ground if you are not going to erect any building? What is the use of going to the pains that we went to, to draw up the specifications of the new building and then saying, 'We will have nothing to do with its erection'? For the specifications of this treaty were American specifications, and we have got not only to be the architects, drawing up the specifications, but we have got to be the contractors, too. Isn't it a job worth while? Isn't it worth while, now that the chance has at last come, in the providence of God, that we should demonstrate to the world that America is what she claimed that she was? Every drop of blood that I have in me gets up and shouts when I think of the opportunity that America has.

"I come of a race that, being bred on barren hills and unfertile plains in Scotland, being obliged to work where work was hard, somehow has the best zest in what it does when the job is hard, and I was repeating to my friend Mr. Jackson what I said the other day about my ancestry and about the implications of it. I come of a certain stock that raised Cain in the northern part of the larger of the British Isles, under the name of the Covenanters. They met in a churchyard—they were church people and they had a convention out of doors—and on the top of a flat tombstone they signed an immortal document called the "solemn league and covenant," which meant that they were going to stand by their religious principles in spite of the Crown of England and the force of England and every other influence, whether of man or the Devil, so long as any of them lived. Now, I have seen men of all nations sit around a table in Paris and sign a solemn league and covenant. They have become Covenanters, and I remain a Covenanter, and I am going to see this job through no matter what influences of evil withstand. [Loud applause.] Nothing has heartened me more on this journey than to feel that that really is the judgment of our fellow citizens. America is made up, as I have just said, out of all sorts of elements, but it is a singularly homogeneous people after all; homogeneous in its ideals, not in its blood; homogeneous in the infection which it has caught from a common light; homogeneous in its purpose. Every man has a sort of consciousness that America is put into the world for a purpose that is different in some respects from the purpose conceived by any other national organization.

"Throughout America you have got a conducting medium. You do not put forth an American idea and find it halted by this man or that or the other, except he be particularly asleep or cantankerous, but it spreads, it spreads by the natural contact of similar ideas and similar ambitions and similar hopes. For, my fellow citizens, the only thing that lifts the world is hope. The only thing that can save the world is such arrangements as will convince the world that hope is not altogether without foundation. It is the spirit that is in it that is unconquerable. You can kill the bodies of insurgent men who are fighting for liberty, but the more of them you kill the more you seem to strengthen the spirit that springs up out of the bloody ground where they fell. The only thing in the world that is unconquerable is the thought of men. One looks back to that legendary



story of the Middle Ages, in which certain men who were fighting under one of the semisavage chiefs of that obscure time refused to obey the order of their chief because they considered it inconsistent with the traditions of their tribe, and he said, 'Don't you know that I have the power to kill you?' They said, 'Yes; and don't you know that we have the power to die cursing you?' You can not cut our spirits out. You can not do anything but lay our bodies low and helpless. If you do, there will spring up, like dragon's teeth out of the earth, armed forces which will overcome you.

"This is the field of the spirit here in America. This is the field of the single unconquerable force that there is in the world, and when the world learns, as it will learn, that America has put her whole force into the common harness of civilization, then it will know that the wheels are going to turn, the loads are going to be drawn, and men are going to begin to ascend those difficult heights of hope which have sometimes seemed so inaccessible. I am glad for one to have lived to see this day. I have lived to see a day in which, after saturating myself most of my life in the history and traditions of America, I seem suddenly to see the culmination of American hope and history—all the orators seeing their dreams realized, if their spirits are looking on; all the men who spoke the noblest sentiments of America heartened with the sight of a great Nation responding to and acting upon those dreams, and saying, 'At last, the world knows America as the savior of the world!'"

THE PRESIDENT AT AUDITORIUM, PORTLAND, OREG., SEPTEMBER 25, 1919.

"Mr. Chairman, Mr. Irvine, my fellow countrymen, Mr. Irvine has very eloquently stated exactly the errand upon which I have come. I have come to confer, face to face, with you on one of the most solemn occasions that have ever confronted this Nation. As I have come along through the country and stopped at station after station, the first to crowd around the train have almost always been little children, bright-eyed little boys, excited little girls, children all seeming sometimes of the same generation, and I have thought as I looked upon them from the car platform that, after all, it was they to whom I had come to report; that I had come to report with regard to the safety and honor of subsequent generations of America, and I felt that if I could not fulfill the task to which I had set my hand, I would have to say to mothers with boy babies at their breast, 'You have occasion to weep; you have occasion to fear. The past is only a prediction of the future, and all this terrible thing that your brothers and husbands and sweethearts have been through may have to be gone through with again.' Because, as I was saying to some of your fellow citizens to-day, the task, that great and gallant task, which our soldiers performed is only half finished. They prevented a great wrong. They prevented it with a spirit and a courage and with an ability that will always be written on the brightest pages of our record of gallantry and of force. I do not know when I have been as proud, as an American, as when I have seen our boys deploy on the other side of the sea. On Christmas Day last, on an open stretch of country, I saw a great division march past me, with all the arms of the service, walking with that swing which is so familiar to our eyes, with that sense of power and confidence and audacity which is so characteristic of America, and I seemed to see the force that had saved the world. But they merely prevented something. They merely prevented a particular nation from doing a particular, unspeakable wrong to civilization, and their task is not complete unless we see to it that it has not to be done over again, unless we fulfill the promise which we made to them and to ourselves that this was not only a war to defeat Germany, but a war to prevent the recurrence of any such wrong as Germany had attempted; that it was a war to put an end to the wars of aggression forever.

"There is only one means of doing that, my fellow citizens. I found quoted in one of your papers the other day a passage so apposite that I do not know that I can do better than read it as the particular thing that it is now necessary to do:

"Nations must unite as men unite in order to preserve peace and order. The great nations must be so united as to be able to say to any single country, 'You must not go to war,' and they can say that effectively when the country desiring war knows that the force which the united nations place behind peace is irresistible. In differences between individuals the decision of a court is final, because in the last resort the entire force of the community is behind the court decision. In differences between nations which go beyond the limited range of arbitral questions, peace can only be maintained by putting behind it the force of united nations determined to uphold it and prevent war."

"That is a quotation from an address said to have been delivered at Union College in June, 1915, a year after the war began, by Mr. HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts. I entirely

concur in Senator LODGE's conclusion, and I hope I shall have his cooperation in bringing about the desired result. In other words, the only way we can prevent the unspeakable thing from happening again is that the nations of the world should unite and put an irresistible force behind peace and order. There is only one conceivable way to do that, and that is by means of a league of nations. The very description is a definition of a league of nations, and the only thing that we can debate now is whether the nations of the world, having met in a universal congress and formulated a covenant as the basis for a league of nations, we are going to accept that or insist upon another. I do not find any man anywhere rash or bold enough to say that he does not desire a league of nations. I only find men here and there saying that they do not desire this league of nations, and I want to ask you to reflect upon what that means. And in order to do that I want to draw a picture for you, if you will be patient with me, of what occurred in Paris.

"In Paris were gathered the representatives of nearly 30 nations from all over the civilized globe, and even from some parts of the globe which in our ignorance of them we have not been in the habit of regarding as civilized, and out of that great body were chosen the representatives of 14 nations, representing all parts of the great stretches of the peoples of the world which the conference as a whole represented. The representatives of those 14 nations were constituted a commission on the league of nations. The first resolution passed by the conference of peace in Paris was a resolution in favor of a league of nations, setting up a commission to formulate a league of nations. It was the thought foremost in the mind of every statesman there. He knew that his errand was in vain in Paris if he went away without achieving the formation of a league of nations, and that he dared not go back and face his people unless he could report that the efforts in that direction had been successful. That commission sat day after day, evening after evening. I had the good fortune to be a member of the commission, and I want to testify to the extraordinary good temper in which the discussions were conducted. I want to testify that there was a universal endeavor to subordinate as much as possible international rivalries and conflicting international interests and come out upon a common ground of agreement in the interest of the world. I want to testify that there were many compromises, but no compromises that sacrificed the principle, and that although the instrument as a whole represented certain mutual concessions, it is a constructive instrument and not a negative instrument. I shall never lose so long as I live the impression of generous, high-minded, statesmanlike cooperation which was manifested in that interesting body. It included representatives of all the most powerful nations, as well as representatives of some of those that were less powerful.

"I could not help thinking as I sat there that the representatives of Italy spoke as it were in the tones of the long tradition of Rome; that we heard the great Latin people who had fought, fought, fought through generation after generation of strife down to this critical moment, speaking now in the counsels of peace. And there sat the prime minister of Greece—the ancient Greek people—lending his singular intelligence, his singularly high-minded and comprehensive counsel, to the general result. There were the representatives also of France, our ancient comrade in the strife for liberty. And there were the representatives of Great Britain, supposed to be the most ambitious, the most desirous of ruling the world of any of the nations of the world, cooperating with a peculiar interest in the result, with a constant and manifestly sincere profession that they wanted to subordinate the interests of the British Empire, which extended all over the world, to the common interests of mankind and of peace. The representatives of Great Britain I may stop to speak of for a moment. There were two of them. One of them was Lord Robert Cecil, who belongs to an ancient family in Great Britain, some of the members of which—particularly Lord Salisbury of a past generation—had always been reputed as most particularly keen to seek and maintain the advantage of the British Empire; and yet I never heard a man speak whose heart was evidently more in the task of the humane redemption of the world than Lord Robert Cecil. And alongside of him sat Gen. Smuts, the South African Boer, the man who had fought Great Britain so successfully that, after the war was over and the Boers nominally defeated, Great Britain saw that the wisest thing she could do was to hand the government of the country over to the Boers themselves. Gen. Botha and Gen. Smuts were both members of the peace conference; both had been successful generals in fighting the British arms. Nobody in the conference was more outspoken in criticizing some aspects of British policy than Gen. Botha and Gen. Smuts, and Gen. Smuts was of the same mind with Sir Robert Cecil. They were both serving the common interests of free people everywhere. You seem to see



a sort of epitome of the history of the world in that conference. There were nations that had long been subordinated and suffering. There were nations that had been indomitably free but, nevertheless, not so free that they could really accomplish the objects that they had always held dear. I want you to realize that this conference was made up of many minds and of many nations and of many traditions, keen to the same conclusion, with a unanimity, an enthusiasm, a spirit which speaks volumes for the future hopes of mankind.

"When this covenant was drawn up in its first form I had the occasion—for me the very happy occasion—to return for a week or so to this country in March last. I brought the covenant in its first draft. I submitted it to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House. We discussed all parts of the document. Many suggestions were made. I took all of those suggestions with me back to Paris, and the conference on the league of nations adopted every one of the suggestions made. No counsels were listened to more carefully or yielded to more willingly in that conference than the counsels of the United States. Some things were put into the covenant which, personally, I did not think necessary, which seemed to me to go without saying, but which they had no objection to putting in there explicitly.

"For example, take the Monroe doctrine. As a matter of fact the covenant sets up for the world a Monroe doctrine. What is the Monroe doctrine? The Monroe doctrine is that no nation shall come to the Western Hemisphere and try to establish its power or interfere with the self-government of the peoples in this hemisphere; that no power shall extend its governing and controlling influence in any form to either of the Americas. Very well; that is the doctrine of the covenant. No nation shall anywhere extend its power or seek to interfere with the political independence of the peoples of the world; and inasmuch as the Monroe doctrine had been made the universal doctrine, I did not think that it was necessary to mention it particularly, but when I suggested that it was the desire of the United States that it should be explicitly recognized, it was explicitly recognized, for it is written in there that nothing in the covenant shall be interpreted as affecting the validity of the Monroe doctrine. The Monroe doctrine is left intact, and the United States is left free to enforce it.

"That is only a sample. The members of the Foreign Relations Committee and of the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not see it anywhere explicitly stated in the covenant that a member of the league could withdraw. I told them that the matter had been discussed in the commission on the league and that it had been the universal opinion that, since it was a combination of sovereigns, any sovereign had the right to withdraw from it; but when I suggested that that should be explicitly put in, no objection was made whatever, and at the suggestion of the United States it was explicitly provided that any member of the league could withdraw. Provision was made that two years' notice should be given, which I think everybody will recognize as perfectly fair, so that no nation is at liberty suddenly to break down this thing upon which the hope of mankind rests; but with that limitation and with the provision that when they withdraw they shall have fulfilled all their international obligations they are perfectly free to withdraw. When gentlemen dwell upon that provision, that we must have fulfilled all our international obligations, I answer all their anxieties by asking them another question, 'When did America ever fail to fulfill her international obligations?' There is no judge in the matter set up in the covenant, except the conscience of the withdrawing nation and the opinion of mankind, and I for one am proud enough American to dismiss from my mind all fear of at any time going before the judgment of mankind on the conduct of the United States, knowing that we will go with clean hands and righteous purpose.

"I am merely illustrating now the provisions that were put in at the suggestion of the United States. Without exception, the suggestions of the United States were adopted, and I want to say, because it may interest you, that most of these suggestions came from Republican sources. I say that, my fellow citizens, not because it seems to me to make the least difference among Americans in a great matter like this which party such things came from, but because I want to emphasize in every discussion of this matter the absolutely nonpartisan character of the covenant and of the treaty. I am not in favor of the ratification of this treaty, including the covenant of the league of nations, because I am a Democrat. I am in favor of it because I am an American and a lover of humanity. If it will relieve anybody's mind, let me add that it is not my work, that practically every portion of the covenant of the league of nations emanates from counsels running back 10, 20, 30 years, among the most thoughtful men in America, and that

it is the fulfillment of a dream which five years ago, when the war began, would have been deemed unattainable. What we are discussing ought not to be disfigured, ought not to be tainted, with the least thought of domestic politics. If anybody in this audience allows himself when thinking of this matter to think of the elections of 1920 I want to declare that I separate myself from him.

"I draw all this picture of the care with which the covenant was drawn up, every phrase scrutinized, every interest considered, the other nations at the board just as jealous of their sovereignty as we could possibly be of ours, and yet willing to harness all these sovereignties in a single great enterprise of peace, and how the whole thing was not the original idea of any man in the conference, but had grown out of the counsels of hopeful and thoughtful and righteous men all over the world; because just as there was in America a league to enforce peace, which even formulated a constitution for the league of peace before the conference met, before the conference was thought of, before the war began, so there were in Great Britain and in France and in Italy and, I believe, even in Germany similar associations of equally influential men, whose ideal was that some time there might come an occasion when men would be sane enough and right enough to get together to do a thing of this great sort. I draw that picture in order to show you the other side of what is going on, and I want to preface this part by saying that I hope you will not construe anything that I say as indicating the least lack of respect for the men who are criticizing any portion of this treaty. For most of them, I have reason to have respect, for I have come into close contact and consultation with them. They are just as good Americans as I claim to be; they are just as thoughtful of the interests of America as I try to be; they are just as intelligent as anybody who could address his mind to this thing; and my contest with them is a contest of interpretation, not a contest of intention. All I have to urge with those men is that they are looking at this thing with too critical an eye as to the mere phraseology, without remembering the purpose that everybody knows to have been in the minds of those who framed it, and that if they go very far in attempting to interpret it by resolutions of the Senate they may, in appearance at any rate, sufficiently alter the meaning of the document to make it necessary to take it back to the council board. Taking it back to the council board means, among other things, taking it back to Germany; and I frankly tell you, my fellow citizens, it would sit very ill upon my stomach to take it back to Germany. Germany, at our request—I may say almost at our dictation—signed the treaty and has ratified it. It is a contract, so far as her part in it is concerned. I can testify that we tried to be just to Germany, and that when we had heard her arguments and examined every portion of the counterproposals that she made, we wrote the treaty in its final form and then said, 'Sign here.' What else did our boys die for? Did they die in order that we might ask Germany's leave to complete our victory? They died in order that we might say to Germany what the terms of victory were in the interest of justice and of peace, and we were entitled to take the course that we did take. I can only beg these gentlemen in their criticism of the treaty and in their action in the Senate not to go so far as to make it necessary to ask the consent of the other nations to the interpretations which they are putting upon the treaty. I have said in all frankness that I do not see a single phrase in the covenant of the league of nations which is of doubtful meaning, but if they want to say what that undoubted meaning is, in other words that do not change the undoubted meaning, I have no objection. If they change the meaning of it, then all the other signatories have to consent; and what has been evident in the last week or two is that on the part of some men, I believe a very few, the desire is to change the treaty, and particularly the covenant, in a way to give America an exceptional footing.

"My fellow citizens, the principle that America went into this war for was the principle of the equality of sovereign nations. I am just as much opposed to class legislation in international matters as in domestic matters. I do not, I tell you plainly, believe that any one nation should be allowed to dominate, even this beloved Nation of our own, and it does not desire to dominate. I said in a speech the other night in another connection that, so far as my influence and power as President of the United States went, I was going to fight every attempt to set up a minority government. I was asked afterwards whom I was hitting at, what minority I was thinking of. I said, 'Never mind what minority I may have been thinking of at the moment; it does not make any difference with me which minority it is; whether it is capital or labor. No sort of privilege will ever be permitted in this country.' It is a partnership or it is a mockery.



It is a democracy, where the majority are the masters, or all the hopes and purposes of the men who founded this Government have been defeated and forgotten. And I am of the same principle in international affairs. One of the things that gave the world a new and a bounding hope was that the great United States had said that it was fighting for the little nation as well as the great nation; that it regarded the rights of the little nation as equal to its own rights; that it would make no distinction between free men anywhere; that it was not fighting for a special advantage for the United States but for an equal advantage for all free men everywhere. Let gentlemen beware, therefore, how they disappoint the world. Let gentlemen beware how they betray the immemorial principles of the United States. Let men not make the mistake of claiming a position of privilege for the United States which gives it all the advantages of the league of nations and none of the risks and responsibilities. The principle of equity everywhere is that along with a right goes a duty; that if you claim a right for yourself you must be ready to support that right for somebody else; that if you claim to be a member in a society of any sort you must not claim the right to dodge the responsibilities and avoid the burden, but you must carry the weight of the enterprise along with the hope of the enterprise. That is the spirit of free men everywhere, and that I know to be the spirit of the United States.

"Our decision, therefore, my fellow citizens, rests upon this: If we want a league of nations, we must take this league of nations, because there is no conceivable way in which any other league of nations is obtainable. We must leave it or take it. I should be very sorry to have the United States indirectly defeat this great enterprise by asking for something, some position of privilege, which other nations in their pride can not grant. I would a great deal rather say flatly, 'She will not go into the enterprise at all.' And that, my fellow citizens, is exactly what Germany is hoping and beginning to dare to expect. I am not uttering a conjecture; I am speaking of knowledge, knowledge of the things that are said in the German newspapers and by German public men. They are taking heart because the United States, they hope, is not going to stand with the other free nations of the world to guarantee the peace that has been forced upon them. They see the hope that there will be two nations standing outside the league—Germany and the United States. Germany because she must; the United States because she will. She knows that that will turn the hostility and enmity of all the other nations of the world against the United States, as their hostility is already directed against her. They do not expect that now the United States will in any way align themselves with Germany. They do not expect the sympathy of the United States to go out to them now, but they do expect the isolation of the United States to bring about an alienation between the United States and the other free nations of the world, which will make it impossible for the world ever to combine again against such enterprises as she was defeated in attempting. All over this country pro-German propaganda is beginning to be active again, beginning to try to add to the force of the arguments against the league in particular and against the treaty and the several items of the treaty. And the poison of failure is being injected into the whole fine body politic of the united world, a sort of paralysis, a sort of fear. Germany desires that we should say, 'What have we created? A great power which will bring peace, but will that power be amiable to us? Can we control that power?' We can not control it for any but its proper purpose—the purpose of righteousness and peace—but for that purpose we are invited to control it by the opinion of mankind, for all over the world peoples are looking to us with confidence, our rivals along with the weaker nations. They believe in the honesty of purpose and the indomitable rectitude of purpose of the United States, and they are willing to have us lead.

"I pray God that the gentlemen who are delaying this thing may presently see it in a different light. I fain would appeal to their hearts. I wonder if they have forgotten what this war meant. I wonder if they have had mothers who lost their sons take them by the hand, as they have taken my own, and looked things that their hearts were too full to speak, praying me to do all in my power to save the sons of other mothers from this terrible thing again. I had one fine woman come to me and say as steadily as if she were saying a commonplace, 'I had the honor to lose a son in the war.' How fine that is—'I had the honor to sacrifice a son for the redemption of mankind!' And yet there is a sob back of the statement, there is a tear brushed hastily away from the cheek. A woman came up to the train the other day and seized my hand and was about to say something when she turned away in a flood of tears. I asked a standerby what was the matter, and he said, 'Why, sir, she lost a son in France.' Mind you, she did not turn away from me. I ordered her son overseas. I advised the Congress of the United States

to sacrifice that son. She came to me as a friend. She had nothing in her heart except the hope that I could save other sons, though she had given hers gladly, and, God helping me, I will save other sons. Through evil report and good report, through resistance and misrepresentation and every other vile thing, I shall fight my way to that goal. I call upon the men to whom I have referred—the honest, patriotic, intelligent men, who have been too particularly concerned in criticizing the details of that treaty—to forget the details, to remember the great enterprise, to stand with me, and fulfill the hopes and traditions of the United States.

"My fellow citizens, there is only one conquering force in the world. There is only one thing you can not kill, and that is the spirit of free men. I was telling some friends to-day of a legendary story of the Middle Ages, of a chieftain of one of the half-civilized peoples that overrun Europe commanding some of his men to do a certain thing which they believed to be against the traditions of their tribe. They refused, and he blazed out upon them, 'Don't you know that I can put you to death?' 'Yes,' they said, 'and don't you know that we can die cursing you?' He could not kill their spirits; and they knew perfectly well that if he unjustly slew them the whole spirit of their tribe would curse him; they knew that, if he did an unjust thing, out of the blood that they split would spring up, as it were, armed men, like dragons' teeth, to overwhelm him. The thing that is vindicated in the long run is the right, and the only thing that is unconquerable is the truth. America is believed in throughout the world, because she has put spirit before material ambition. She has said that she is willing to sacrifice everything that she is and everything that she has not only that her people may be free but that freedom may reign throughout the world.

"I hear men say—how often I heard it said on the other side of the water!—how amazing it was that America went into this war. I tell you, my fellow citizens—I tell it with sorrow—it was universally believed on the other side of the water that we would not go into the war because we were making money out of it, and loved the money better than we loved justice. They all believed that. When we went over there they greeted us with amazement. They said, 'These men did not have to come. Their territories are not invaded. Their independence is not directly threatened. Their interests were not immediately attacked, only indirectly. They were getting a great prosperity out of this calamity of ours, and we were told that they worshipped the almighty dollar; but here come, tramping, tramping, tramping, these gallant fellows with something in their faces we never saw before—eyes lifted to the horizon, a dash that knows no discouragement, a knowledge only of how to go forward, no thought of how to go backward—3,000 miles from home. What are they fighting for? Look at their faces and you will see the answer. They see a vision. They see a cause. They see mankind redeemed. They see a great force which would recall civilization. They love something they have never touched. They love the things that emanate from the throne of justice, and they have come here to fight with us and for us, and they are our comrades.'

"We were told by certain people in France that they went to the Fourth of July celebration last calendar year in Paris with sinking hearts. Our men had just begun to come over in numbers. They did not expect they would come soon enough or fast enough to save them. They went out of courtesy; and before the day was over, having merely been in the presence of those boys, they knew that Europe was saved, because they had seen what that blind man saw in the song. You have heard that spirited song of the blind Frenchman, his boy at the window, music in the streets, the marching of troops, and he says to the lad, 'See what that is. What do you see, lad? What are the colors? What are the men? Is there a banner with red and white stripes upon it? Is there a bit of heaven in the corner? Are there stars in that piece of the firmament? Ah, thank God, the Americans have come!' It was the revelation to Europe of the heart of a great Nation, and they believe in that heart now. You never hear the old sneers. You never hear the old intimation that we will seek our interest and not our honor. You never hear the old fear that we shall not stand by free men elsewhere who make common cause with us for justice to mankind. You hear, on the contrary, confident predilection, confident expectation, a confident hope that the whole world will be steadied by the magnificent purpose and force of the United States. If I was proud as an American before I went over there—and I hope my pride had just foundation—I was infinitely more proud when I came back to feel that I could bring you this message.

"My fellow citizens, let us—every one of us—bind ourselves in a solemn league and covenant of our own that we will redeem



this expectation of the world, that we will not allow any man to stand in the way of it, that the world shall hereafter bless and not curse us, that the world hereafter shall follow us and not turn aside from us, and that in leading we will not lead along the paths of private advantage, we will not lead along the paths of national ambition, but we will be proud and happy to lead along the paths of right, so that men shall always say that American soldiers saved Europe and American citizens saved the world."

THE PRESIDENT AT LUNCHEON, PALACE HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
SEPTEMBER 17, 1919.

"Mrs. Mott and my fellow citizens, Mrs. Mott has very happily interpreted the feeling with which I face this great audience. I have come to get a consciousness of your support and of your sentiment, at a time in the history of the world, I take leave to say, more critical than has ever been known during the history of the United States. I have felt a certain burden of responsibility as I have mixed with my fellow countrymen across the continent, because I have feared at times that there were those amongst us who did not realize just what the heart of this question is. I have been afraid that their thoughts were lingering in a past day when the calculation was always of national advantage, and that it had not come to see the light of the new day in which men are thinking of the common advantage and safety of mankind. The issue is nothing else. Either we must stand apart, and in the phrase of some gentlemen, 'take care of ourselves,' which means antagonize others, or we must join hands with the other great nations of the world and with the weak nations of the world, in seeing that justice is everywhere maintained.

"Quite apart from the merits of any particular question that may be raised about the treaty itself, I think we are under a certain moral compulsion to accept this treaty. In the first place, my fellow citizens, it was laid down according to American specifications. The initial suggestions upon which this treaty is based emanated from America. I would not have you understanding me as meaning that they were ideas confined to America, because the promptness with which they were accepted, the joy with which they were hailed in some parts of the world, the readiness of the leaders of nations that had been supposed to be seeking chiefly their own interest in adopting these principles as the principles of the peace, show that they were listening to the counsels of their own people, that they were listening to those who knew the critical character of the new age and the necessity we were under to take new measures for the peace of the world, because the thing that had happened was intolerable. The thing that Germany attempted, if it had succeeded, would have set the civilization of the world back a hundred years. We have prevented it, but prevention is not enough. We have shown Germany—and not Germany only, but the world—that upon occasion the great peoples of the world will combine to prevent an iniquity, but we have not shown how that is going to be done in the future with a certainty that will make every other nation know that a similar enterprise must not be attempted.

"Again and again, as I have crossed the continent, generous women, women I did not know, have taken me by the hand and said, 'God bless you, Mr. President.' Some of them, like many of you, had lost sons and husbands and brothers in the war. Why should they bless me? I advised Congress to declare war. I advised Congress to send their sons to their death. As commander in chief of the Army, I sent them over the seas, and they were killed. Why should they bless me? Because in the generosity of their hearts they want the sons of other women saved henceforth, and they believe that the methods proposed at any rate create a very hopeful expectation that similar wars will be prevented, and that other armies will not have to go from the United States to die upon distant fields of battle. The moral compulsion upon us, upon us who at the critical stage of the world saved the world and who threw in our fortunes with all the forward-looking peoples of the world—the moral compulsion upon us to stand by and see it through is overwhelming. We can not now turn back. We made the choice in April, 1917. We can not with honor reverse it now.

"Not only is there the compulsion of honor, but there is the compulsion of interest. I never like to speak of that, because, notwithstanding the reputation that we had throughout the world before we made the great sacrifice of this war, this Nation does love its honor better than it loves its interest. It does yield to moral compulsion more readily than to material compulsion. That is the glory of America. That is the spirit in which she was conceived and born. That is the mission that she has in the world. She always has lived up to it, and, God helping her, she always will live up to it. But if you want, as

some of our fellow countrymen insist, to dwell upon the material side of it and our interest in the matter, our commercial interest, draw the picture for yourselves. The other nations of the world are drawing together. We who suggested that they should draw together in this new partnership stand aside. We at once draw their suspicion upon us. We at once draw their intense hostility upon us. We at once renew the thing that had begun to be done before we went into the war. There was a conference in Paris not many months before we went into the war in which the nations then engaged against Germany attempted to draw together in an exclusive economic combination where they should serve one another's interest and exclude those who had not participated in the war from sharing in that interest, and just so certainly as we stay out, every market that can possibly be closed against us will be closed. If you merely look at it from the point of view of the material prosperity of the United States, we are under compulsion to stay in the partnership. I was asking some gentlemen the other day who were engaged in commerce of various sorts, 'Can you sell more easily to a man who trusts you or to a man who distrusts you?' There can be but one answer to that question. Can you sell more easily to a man who takes your goods because he can not do without them or to a man who wants them and believes them the best? The thing demonstrates itself. You make all the lines of trade lines of resistance unless you prove true to the things that you have attempted and undertaken.

"Then, there is a deeper compulsion even than those, the compulsion of humanity. If there is one thing that America ought to have learned more promptly than any other country it is that, being made up out of all the ranks of humanity, in serving itself it must serve the human race. I suppose I could not command the words which would exaggerate the present expectations of the world with regard to the United States. Nothing more thrilling, nothing more touching, happened to me on the other side of the water than the daily evidences that, not the weak peoples merely, not the peoples of countries that had been allowed to shift for themselves and had always borne the chief burden of the world's sufferings, but the great peoples as well, the people of France as well as the people of Serbia, the people of all the nations that had looked this terror in the face, were turning to the United States and saying, 'We depend upon you to take the lead, to direct us how to go out of this wilderness of doubt and fear and terror.' We can not desert humanity. We are the trustees of humanity, and we must see that we redeem the pledges which are always implicit in so great a trusteeship.

"So, feeling these compulsions, the compulsion of honor, the compulsion of interest, and the compulsion of humanity, I wonder what it is that is holding some minds back from acquiescence in this great enterprise of peace. I must admit to you, my fellow citizens, that I have been very much puzzled. I can not conceive a motive adequate to hold men off from this thing, and when I examine the objections which they make to the treaty I can but wonder if they are really thinking, or if, on the other hand, there is some emotion coming from fountains that I do not know of which are obliging them to take this course.

"Let me take the point in which my initial sympathy is most with them, the matter of the cession to Japan of the interests of Germany in Shantung, in China. I said to my Japanese colleagues on the other side of the sea, and therefore I am at liberty to say in public, I am not satisfied with that settlement. I think it ought to have been different, but when gentlemen propose to cure it by striking that clause out of the treaty or by ourselves withholding our adherence to the treaty, they propose an irrational thing. Let me remind you of some of the history of this business. It was in 1898 that China ceded these rights and concessions to Germany. The pretext was that some German missionaries had been killed. My heart aches, I must say, when I think how we have made an excuse of religion sometimes to work a deep wrong. The central Government of China had done all that they could to protect those German missionaries; their death was due to local disturbances, to local passion, to local antipathy against the foreigner. There was nothing that the Chinese Government as a whole could justly be held responsible for; but suppose there had been. Two Christian missionaries are killed, and therefore one great nation robs another nation and does a thing which is fundamentally un-Christian and heathen! For there was no adequate excuse for what Germany exacted of China. I read again only the other day the phrases in which poor China was made to make the concessions. She was made to make them in words dictated by Germany, in view of her gratitude to Germany for certain services rendered—the deepest hypocrisy conceivable! She was obliged to do so by force.



"Then, what happened, my fellow citizens? Then Russia came in and obliged China to cede her Port Arthur and Tallien Wan, not for quite so long a period, but upon substantially the same terms. Then England must needs have Wei-Hai-Wei as an equivalent concession to that which had been made to Germany; and presently certain ports, with the territory back of them, were ceded upon similar principles to France. Everybody got in, except the United States, and said, 'If Germany is going to get something, we will get something.' Why? None of them had any business in there on such terms.

"Then when the Japanese-Russian War came, Japan did what she has done in this war. She attacked Port Arthur and captured Port Arthur, and Port Arthur was ceded to her as a consequence of the war. Not one official voice was raised in the United States against that cession. No protest was made. No protest was made by the Government of the United States against the original cession of this Shantung territory to Germany. One of the highest minded men of our history was President at that time—I mean Mr. McKinley. One of the ablest men that we have had as Secretary of State, Mr. John Hay, occupied that great office. In the message of Mr. McKinley about this transaction, he says—I am quoting his language—that inasmuch as the powers that had taken these territories had agreed to keep the door open there for our commerce, there was no reason why we should object. Just so we could trade with these stolen territories we were willing to let them be stolen. Which of these gentlemen who are now objecting to the cession of the German rights in Shantung to Japan were prominent in protesting against the original cession or any one of those original cessions? It makes my heart burn when some men are so late in doing justice.

"In the meantime, before we got into this war, but after the war had begun, because they deemed the assistance of Japan in the Pacific absolutely indispensable, Great Britain and France both agreed that if Japan would enter and cooperate in the war she could do the same thing with regard to Shantung that she had done with regard to Port Arthur; that if she would take what Germany had in China she could keep it. She took it. She has it now. Her troops are there. She has it as spoils of war. Observe, my fellow citizens, we are not taking this thing away from China; we are taking it from Germany. China had ceded it for 99 years, and there are 78 of those 99 to run yet. They were Germany's rights in Shantung, not China's, that were ceded by the treaty to Japan, but with a difference—a difference which never occurred in any of these other cases—a difference which was not insisted upon at the cession of Port Arthur—upon a condition that no other nation in doing similar things in China has ever yielded to. Japan is under solemn promise to forego all sovereign rights in the Province of Shantung and to retain only what private corporations have elsewhere in China, the right of concessionaires with regard to the operation of the railway and the exploitation of the mines. Scores of foreign corporations have that right in other parts of China.

"But it does not stop there. Coupled with this arrangement is the league of nations, under which Japan solemnly undertakes, with the rest of us, to protect the territorial integrity of China, along with the territorial integrity of other countries, and back of her promise lies the similar promise of every other nation, that nowhere will they countenance a disregard for the territorial integrity or the political independence of that great helpless people, lying there hitherto as an object of prey in the great Orient. It is the first time in the history of the world that anything has been done for China, and sitting around our council board in Paris I put this question: 'May I expect that this will be the beginning of the retrocession to China of the exceptional rights which other Governments have enjoyed there?' The responsible representatives of the other great Governments said, 'Yes; you may expect it.' Expect it?

"Your attention is constantly drawn to article 10, and that is the article—the heart of the covenant—which guarantees the territorial integrity and political independence not only of China, but of other countries more helpless even than China; but, besides article 10, there is article 11, which makes it the right of every member of the league, big or little, influential or not influential, to draw attention to anything, anywhere, that is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. Whenever formerly anything was done in detriment of the interests of China, we had to approach the Government that did it with apologies. We had, as it were, to say, 'This is none of our business, but we would like to suggest that this is not in the interest of China.' I am repeating, not the words but the purport of notes that I have signed myself to Japan, in which I was obliged to use all the genuflections of apology and say, 'The United States believes that this is wrong in principle and

suggests to the Japanese Government that the matter be reconsidered.' Now, when you have the league of nations the representative of the United States has the right to stand up and say, 'This is against the covenants of peace; it can not be done,' and if occasion arises we can add, 'It shall not be done.' The weak and oppressed and wronged peoples of the world have never before had a forum made for them in which they can summon their enemies into the presence of the judgment of mankind, and if there is one tribunal that the wrongdoer ought to dread more than another it is that tribunal of the opinion of mankind. Some nations keep their international promises only because they wish to obtain the respect of mankind. You remember those immortal words in the opening part of the Declaration of Independence. I wish I could quote them literally, but they run this way, that out of respect for the opinion of mankind the leaders of the American Revolution now state the causes which have led them to separate themselves from Great Britain. America was the first to set that example, the first to admit that right and justice and even the basis of revolution was a matter upon which mankind was entitled to form a judgment.

"If we do not take part in this thing, what happens? France and England are absolutely bound to this thing without any qualifications. The alternative is to defend China in the future with important concessions to begin with, or else let the world go back to its old methods of rapacity; or else take up arms against France and England and Japan, and begin the shedding of blood over again, almost fratricidal blood. Does that sound like a practical program? Does that sound like doing China a service? Does that sound like anything that is rational?

"Go to other matters with which I have less patience, other objections to the league. I have spoken of article 10. Those who object to article 10 object to entering the league with any responsibilities whatever. They want to make it a matter of opinion merely and not a matter of action. They know just as well as I know that there is nothing in article 10 that can oblige the Congress of the United States to declare war if it does not deem it wise to declare war. We engage with the other nations of the world to preserve as against external aggression—not as against internal revolution—the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members of the league; and then, in the next sentence, it is said that the council of the league of nations shall advise with regard to the measures which may be necessary to carry out this promise on the part of the members. As I have said several times in my speeches, I have in vain searched the dictionary to find any other meaning for the word 'advise' than 'advise.' These gentlemen would have you believe that our armies can be ordered abroad by some other power or by a combination of powers. They are thinking in an air-tight compartment. America is not the only proud nation in the world. I can testify from my share in the counsels on the other side of the sea that the other nations are just as jealous of their sovereignty as we are of ours. They would no more have dreamed of giving us the right of ordering out their armies than we would have dreamed of giving them the right to order out our armies. The advice can come from the United States only after the United States representative votes in the affirmative.

"We have got an absolute veto on the thing, unless we are parties to the dispute, and I want again to call attention to what that means. That means unless we want to seize somebody's territory or invade somebody's political independence, or unless somebody else wants to seize our territory and invade our political independence. I regard either of those contingencies as so remote that they are not troubling me in the least. I know the people of this country well enough to know that we will not be the aggressors in trying to execute a wrong, and in looking about me I do not see anybody else that would think it wise to try it on us. But suppose we are parties. Then is it the council of the league that is forcing war upon us? The war is ours anyhow. We are in circumstances where it is necessary for Congress, if it wants to steal somebody's territory or prevent somebody from stealing our territory, to go to war. It is not the council of the league that brings us into war at that time, in such circumstances; it is the unfortunate circumstances which have arisen in some matter of aggression. I want to say again that article 10 is the very heart of the covenant of the league, because all the great wrongs of the world have had their root in the seizure of territory or the control of the political independence of other peoples. I believe that I speak the feeling of the people of the United States when I say that, having seen one great wrong like that attempted and having prevented it, we are ready to prevent it again.

"Those are the two principal criticisms—that we did not do the impossible with regard to Shantung and that we may be ad-



vised to go to war. That is all there is in either of those. But they say, 'We want the Monroe doctrine more distinctly acknowledged.' Well, if I could have found language that was more distinct than that used, I should have been very happy to suggest it, but it says in so many words that nothing in that document shall be construed as affecting the validity of the Monroe doctrine. I do not see what more it could say, but, as I say, if the clear can be clarified, I have no objection to its being clarified. The meaning is too obvious to admit of discussion, and I want you to realize how extraordinary that provision is. Every nation in the world had been jealous of the Monroe doctrine, had studiously avoided doing or saying anything that would admit its validity, and here all the great nations of the world sign a document which admits its validity. That constitutes nothing less than a moral revolution in the attitude of the rest of the world toward America.

"What does the Monroe doctrine mean in that covenant? It means that with regard to aggressions upon the Western Hemisphere we are at liberty to act without waiting for other nations to act. That is the Monroe doctrine. The Monroe doctrine says that if anybody tries to interfere with affairs in the Western Hemisphere it will be regarded as an unfriendly act to the United States—not to the rest of the world—and that means that the United States will look after it, and will not ask anybody's permission to look after it. The document says that nothing in this document must be construed as interfering with that. I dismiss the objections to the Monroe doctrine all the more because this is what happened: I brought the first draft of the covenant to this country in March last. I then invited the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to the White House to dinner, and after dinner we had the frankest possible conference with regard to this draft. When I went back to Paris I carried every suggestion that was made in that conference to the commission on the league of nations, which consisted of representatives of 14 nations, and every one of the suggestions of those committees was embodied in the document. I suppose it is a pride of style. I suppose that, although the substance was embodied, they would rather write it differently, but, after all, that is a literary matter. After all, that is a question of pride in the command of the English language, and I must say that there were a great many men on that commission on the league of nations who seemed perfectly to understand the English language and who wished to express, not only in the English text but in its French equivalent, exactly what we wanted to say.

"One of the suggestions I carried over was that we should have the right to withdraw. I must say that I did not want to say, 'We are going into this if you promise we can scuttle whenever we want to.' That did not seem to me a very handsome thing to propose, and I told the men in the conference at the White House, when they raised the question, that it had been raised in the commission on the league of nations and that it was the unanimous opinion of the international lawyers of that body that, inasmuch as this was an association of sovereigns, they had the right to withdraw. But I conceded that if that right was admitted there could be no harm in stating it, and so in the present draft of the covenant it is stated that any member may withdraw upon two years' notice, which, I think, is not an unreasonable length of time, provided that at the end of the two years all the international obligations of that power under the covenant shall have been fulfilled. Would you wish any other condition? Would you wish the United States allowed to withdraw without fulfilling its obligations? Is that the kind of people we are? Moreover, have we ever failed to fulfill our international obligations? It is a point of pride with me, my fellow citizens, not to debate this question. I will not debate with anybody whether the United States is likely to withdraw without fulfilling its obligations or not, and if other gentlemen entertain that possibility and expectation, I separate myself from them.

"But there is another matter. They say that the British Empire has six votes and we have only one. It happens that our one is as big as the six, and that satisfies me entirely. Let me explain what I mean. It is only in the assembly that the British Empire has six votes—not in the council—and there is only one thing that the assembly votes on in which it can decide a matter without the concurrence of all the States represented on the council, and that is the admission of new members to the league of nations. With regard to every other matter, for example, amendments to the covenant, with regard to cases referred out of the council to the assembly, it is provided that if a majority of the assembly and the representatives of all the States represented on the council concur, the vote

shall be valid and conclusive, which means that the affirmative vote of the United States is in every instance just as powerful as the six votes of the British Empire. I took the pains yesterday, I believe it was, on the train, to go through the covenant almost sentence by sentence again, to find if there was any case other than the one I have mentioned in which that was not true, and there is no other case in which that is not true. Of course, you will understand that wherever the United States is a party to a quarrel and that quarrel is carried to the assembly, we can not vote; but, similarly, if the British Empire is a party her six representatives can not vote. It is an even break any way you take it, and I would rather count six as one person than six as six persons. So far as I can see, it makes me a bigger man. The point to remember is that the energy of the league of nations resides in the council, not in the assembly, and that in the council there is a perfect equality of votes. That settles that matter, and even some of my fellow countrymen who insist upon keeping a hyphen in the middle of their names ought to be satisfied with that—though I must admit that I do not care to argue anything with a hyphen. A man that puts anything else before the word 'American' is no comrade of mine, and yet I am willing even to discomfit him with a statement of fact.

"Those are the objections to yielding to these compulsions of honor, interest, and humanity, and it is because of the nature of these objections, their flimsiness, the impossibility of supporting them with conclusive argument, that I am profoundly puzzled to know what is back of the opposition to the league of nations. I know one of the results, and that is to raise the hope in the minds of the German people that, after all, they can separate us from those who were our associates in the war. I know that the pro-German propaganda which had theretofore not dared to raise its head again has now boldly raised its head and is active all over the United States. These are disturbing and illuminating circumstances. Pray understand me; I am not accusing some of the honorable men whose objections I am trying to answer with trying to draw near to Germany. That is not my point; but I am saying that what they are attempting to do is exactly what Germany desires, and that it would touch the honor of the United States very near if at the end of this great struggle we should seek to take the position which our enemies desire and our friends deplore.

"I am arguing the matter only because I am a very patient man. I have not the slightest doubt as to what the result is going to be. I have felt the temper and high purpose of this great people as I have crossed this wonderful land of ours, and one of the things that make it most delightful to stand here is to remember that the people of the Pacific coast were the first to see the new duty in its entirety. It is a remarkable circumstance that you people, who were farthest from the field of conflict, most remote from that contact of interests which stirred so many peoples, yet outdid the rest of the country in volunteering for service and volunteering your money. As I came through that wonderful country to the north of us it occurred to me one day that the aspiring lines of those wonderful mountains must lead people's eyes to be drawn upward and to look into the blue serene and see things apart from the confusions of affairs, to see the real, pure vision of the interests of humanity; and that, after all, the spirit of America was best expressed where people withdrew their thoughts from the entangling interests of everyday life, purified their motives from all that was selfish and groveling and based upon the desire to seize and get and turned their thoughts to those things that are worth living for.

"The only thing that makes the world inhabitable is that it is sometimes ruled by its purest spirits. I want to leave this illustration, which I have often used, in your minds of what I mean. Some years ago some one said to me that the modern world was a world in which the mind was monarch, and my reply was that if that was true it must be one of those modern monarchs that reigned and did not govern; that, as a matter of fact, the world was governed by a great popular assembly made up of the passions and that the constant struggle of civilization was to see that the handsome passions had a working majority. That is the problem of civilization, that the things that engage the best impulses of the human spirit should be the prevailing things, the conquering things, the things that one can die comfortably after achieving. How do men ever go to sleep that have conceived wrong? How do men ever get their own consent to laugh who have not looked the right in the face and extended their hand to it? If America can in the future look the rest of the world in the face, it will be because she has been the champion of justice and of right."



THE PRESIDENT AT AUDITORIUM, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 17, 1918.

"Mr. Chairman, Mr. Rolph, my fellow countrymen, you have given me a very royal welcome, and I am profoundly appreciative of the greeting that you have extended me. It is a matter of gratification to me to be permitted to speak to this great audience representing as it does one of the most forward-looking States of the Union, representing as it does a great body of people who are accustomed to look and plan to the future. As I picture to myself the history of this great country which we love, I remember the surging tides of humanity moving always westward, over the eastern mountains and the plains, deploying upon the great further slopes of the Rockies, then overflowing into these fertile and beautiful valleys by the Pacific; and that is a picture to me of the constant forward, confident, hopeful movement of the American people. I feel that it is not without significance that this was the portion of the country which responded with the most extraordinary spirit to the call to arms, responded with the utmost spontaneity and generosity to the call for the money of the people to be loaned to the Government for the conduct of the Great War, responded to all those impulses of purpose and of freedom which underlay the great struggle we have just passed through.

"As I have passed through your streets to-day, and through others in the many generous communities north of you and east of you, you have made me feel how the spirit of the American people is coming to a single vision, how the thought of the American people is back of a single purpose. I have come before you, my fellow citizens, to discuss a very serious theme. I want to analyze for you the very important issue with which this Nation is now face to face. It is by far the most important question that has ever come before this people for decision, and the reason I have come out upon this long journey is that I am conscious that it is the people, their purpose, their wish, that is to decide this thing, and not the thought of those who are planning any private purpose of their own.

"What I first want to call your attention to, my fellow citizens, is this: You know that the debate in which we are engaged centers first of all upon the league of nations, and there seems to have arisen an idea in some quarters that the league of nations is an idea recently conceived, conceived by a small number of persons, somehow originated by the American representatives at the council table in Paris. Nothing could be further from the truth than that. I would not feel the confidence that I feel in the league of nations if I felt that it was so recent and novel a growth and birth as that. On the contrary, it is the fruit of many generations of thoughtful, forward-looking men, not only in this country but in the other countries of the world, who have been able to look forward to the combined fortunes of mankind. The men who have conceived this great purpose are not men who through these generations, when they were concerting counsel in this great matter, thought of the fortunes of parties, thought of the fortunes of individuals. I would be ashamed of myself, as I am frankly ashamed of any fellow countryman of mine who does it, if I discussed this great question with any portion of my thought devoted to the contest of parties and the elections of next year.

"Some of the greatest spirits, some of the most instructed minds of both parties have been devoted to this great idea for more than a generation. It has come before the Paris conference out of the stage of ideal conception. It had long before that begun to assume the shape of a definite program and plan for the concert and cooperation of the nations in the interest of the peace of the world, and when I went to Paris I was conscious that I was carrying there no plan which was novel either to America or to Europe, but a plan which all statesmen who realized the real interests of their people had long ago hoped might be carried out in some day when the world would realize what the peace of the world meant and what were its necessary foundations. When I got to Paris I was not conscious of presenting anything that they had not long considered, and I felt that I was merely the spokesman of thoughtful minds and hopeful spirits in America. I was not putting forward any purpose of my own. So that I beg you will dismiss any personal appearance or personal relationship which this great plan may bear. I would indeed be a very proud man if I had personally conceived this great idea, but I can claim no such honor. I can only claim the privilege of having been the obedient servant of the great ideals and purposes of beloved America.

"I want you to realize, my fellow countrymen, that those Americans who are opposing this plan of the league of nations offer no substitute. They offer nothing that they pretend will accomplish the same object. On the contrary, they are apparently willing to go back to that old and evil order which prevailed before this war began and which furnished a ready

and fertile soil for those seeds of envy which sprung up like dragon's teeth out of the bloody soil of Europe. They are ready to go back to that old and ugly plan of armed nations, of alliances, of watchful jealousies, of rabid antagonisms, of purposes concealed, running by the subtle channels of intrigue through the veins of people who do not dream what poison is being injected into their systems. They are willing to have the United States stand alone, withdraw from the concert of nations; and what does that mean, my fellow citizens? It means that we shall arm as Germany was armed, that we shall submit our young men to the kind of constant military service that the young men of Germany were subjected to. It means that we shall pay not lighter but heavier taxes. It means that we shall trade in a world in which we are suspected and watched and disliked, instead of in a world which is now ready to trust us, ready to follow our leadership, ready to receive our traders, along with our political representatives as friends, as men who are welcome, as men who bring goods and ideas for which the world is ready and for which the world has been waiting. That is the alternative which they offer.

"It is my purpose, fellow citizens, to analyze the objections which are made to this great league, and I shall be very brief. In the first place, you know that one of the difficulties which have been experienced by those who are objecting to this league is that they do not think that there is a wide enough door open for us to get out. For my own part, I am not one of those who, when they go into a generous enterprise, think first of all how they are going to turn away from those with whom they are associated. I am not one of those who, when they go into a concert for the peace of the world, want to sit close to the door with their hand on the knob and constantly trying the door to be sure that it is not locked. If we want to go into this thing—and we do want to go into it—we will go in it with our whole hearts and settled purpose to stand by the great enterprise to the end. Nevertheless, you will remember—some of you, I dare say—that when I came home in March for an all too brief visit to this country, which seems to me the fairest and dearest in the world, I brought back with me the first draft of the covenant of the league of nations. I called into consultation the Committees on Foreign Affairs and on Foreign Relations of the House and Senate of the United States, and I laid the draft of the covenant before them. One of the things that they proposed was that it should be explicitly stated that any member of the league should have the right to withdraw. I carried that suggestion back to Paris, and without the slightest hesitation it was accepted and acted upon; and every suggestion which was made in that conference at the White House was accepted by the conference of peace in Paris. There is not a feature of the covenant, except one, now under debate upon which suggestions were not made at that time, and there is not one of those suggestions that was not adopted by the conference of peace.

"The gentlemen say, 'You have laid a limitation upon the right to withdraw. You have said that we can withdraw upon two years' notice, if at that time we shall have fulfilled all our international obligations and all our obligations under the covenant.' 'Yes,' I reply; 'is it characteristic of the United States not to fulfill her international obligations? Is there any fear that we shall wish to withdraw dishonorably? Are gentlemen willing to stand up and say that they want to get out whether they have the moral right to get out or not?' I for one am too proud as an American to debate that subject on that basis. The United States has always fulfilled its international obligations, and, God helping her, she always will. There is nothing in the covenant to prevent her acting upon her own judgment with regard to that matter. The only thing she has to fear, the only thing she has to regard, is the public opinion of mankind, and, inasmuch as we have always scrupulously satisfied the public opinion of mankind with regard to justice and right, I for my part am not afraid at any time to go before that jury. It is a jury that might condemn us if we did wrong, but it is not a jury that could oblige us to stay in the league, so that there is absolutely no limitation upon our right to withdraw.

"One of the other suggestions I carried to Paris was that the committees of the two Houses did not find the Monroe doctrine safeguarded in the covenant of the league of nations. I suggested that to the conference in Paris, and they at once inserted the provision which is now there that nothing in that covenant shall be construed as affecting the validity of the Monroe doctrine. What is the validity of the Monroe doctrine? The Monroe doctrine means that if any outside power, any power outside this hemisphere, tries to impose its will upon any portion of the Western Hemisphere the United States is at liberty to act independently and alone in repelling the aggression;



that it does not have to wait for the action of the league of nations; that it does not have to wait for anything but the action of its own administration and its own Congress. This is the first time in the history of international diplomacy that any great government has acknowledged the validity of the Monroe doctrine. Now for the first time all the great fighting powers of the world except Germany, which for the time being has ceased to be a great fighting power, acknowledge the validity of the Monroe doctrine and acknowledge it as part of the international practice of the world.

"They are nervous about domestic questions. They say, 'It is intolerable to think that the league of nations should interfere with domestic questions,' and whenever they begin to specify they speak of the question of immigration, of the question of naturalization, of the question of the tariff. My fellow citizens, no competent or authoritative student of international law would dream of maintaining that these were anything but exclusively domestic questions, and the covenant of the league expressly provides that the league can take no action whatever about matters which are in the practice of international law regarded as domestic questions. We did not undertake to enumerate samples of domestic questions for the very good reason, which will occur to any lawyer, that if you made a list it would be inferred that what you left out was not included. Nobody with a thoughtful knowledge of international practice has the least doubt as to what are domestic questions, and there is no obscurity whatever in this covenant with regard to the safeguarding of the United States, along with other sovereign countries, in the control of domestic questions. I beg that you will not fancy, my fellow citizens, that the United States is the only country that is jealous of its sovereignty. Throughout these conferences it was necessary at every turn to safeguard the sovereign independence of the several governments who were taking part in the conference, and they were just as keen to protect themselves against outside intervention in domestic matters as we were. Therefore the whole heartiness of their concurrent opinion runs with this safeguarding of domestic questions.

"It is objected that the British Empire has six votes and we have one. The answer to that is that it is most carefully arranged that our one vote equals the six votes of the British Empire. Anybody who will take the pains to read the covenant of the league of nations will find out that the assembly—and it is only in the assembly that the British Empire has six votes—is not a voting body. There is a very limited number of subjects upon which it can act at all, and I have taken the pains to write them down here, after again and again going through the covenant for the purpose of making sure that I had not omitted anything, in order that I might give you an explicit account of the thing. There are two things which a majority of the assembly may do without the concurrent vote of the United States. A majority of the assembly can admit a new member to the league of nations. A majority of the assembly can recommend to any nation a member of the league a reconsideration of such treaties as are apparently in conflict with the provisions of the covenant itself; it can advise any member of the league to seek a reconsideration of any international obligation which seems to conflict with the covenant itself, but it has no means whatever of obliging it to reconsider even so important a matter as that, which is obviously a moral duty on the part of any member of the league. All the action, all the energy, all the initiative, of the league of nations is resident in the council, and in the council a unanimous vote is necessary for action, and no action is possible without the concurrent vote of the United States. I would rather, personally, as one man count for six than be six men and count only six. The United States can offset six votes. Here are the cases: When a matter in dispute is referred by the council to the assembly its action must be taken by a majority vote of the assembly, concurred in by the representatives of all the governments represented in the council, so that the concurrence of the vote of the United States is absolutely necessary to an affirmative vote of the assembly itself. In the case of an amendment to the covenant it is necessary that there should be a unanimous vote of the representatives of the nations which are represented in the council in addition to a majority vote of the assembly itself. And there is all the voting that the assembly does.

"Not a single affirmative act or negative decision upon a matter of action taken by the league of nations can be validated without the vote of the United States of America. We can dismiss from our dreams the six votes of the British Empire, for the real underlying conception of the assembly of the league of nations is that it is the forum of opinion, not of action. It is the debating body; it is the body where the thought of the little

nation along with the thought of the big nation is brought to bear upon those matters which affect the peace of the world, is brought to bear upon those matters which affect the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends; where this stifled voice of humanity is at last to be heard, where nations that have borne the unspeakable sufferings of the ages that must have seemed to them like æons will find voice and expression, where the moral judgment of mankind can sway the opinion of the world. That is the function of the assembly. The assembly is the voice of mankind. The council, where unanimous action is necessary, is the only means through which that voice can accomplish action.

"You say, 'We have heard a great deal about article 10.' I just now said that the only substitute for the league of nations which is offered by the opponents is a return to the old system. What was the old system? That the strong had all the rights and need pay no attention to the rights of the weak; that if a great, powerful nation saw what it wanted, it had the right to go and take it; that the weak nations could cry out and cry out as they pleased and there would be no hearkening ear anywhere to their rights. I want to bring in another subject connected with this treaty, but not with the league of nations, to illustrate what I am talking about. You have heard a great deal about the cession to Japan of the rights which Germany had acquired in Shantung Province in China. What happened under the old order of things, my fellow citizens? The story begins in 1898. Two German missionaries were killed in China by parties over whom the Central Government of China was unable to exercise control. It was one of those outbreaks, like the pitiful Boxer rebellion, where a sudden hatred of foreigners wells up in the heart of a nation uninformed, aware of danger, aware of wrong, but not knowing just how to remedy it, not knowing just what was the instrumentality of right. And, my fellow citizens, why should not the Chinaman hate the foreigner? The foreigner has always taken from him everything that he could get. When by irresponsible persons these German missionaries were murdered, the German Government insisted that a great part of the fair Province of Shantung should be turned over to them for exploitation. They insisted that the accessible part of Kaiochow Bay, the part where trade entered and left, should be delivered over to them for sovereign control for 99 years, and that they should be given a concession for a railway into the interior and for the right to exploit mines in that rich mineral country for 30 miles on either side of the railway.

"This was not unprecedented, my fellow countrymen. Other civilized nations had done the same thing to China, and at that time what did the Government of the United States do? I want to speak with the utmost respect for the administration of that time, and the respect is unaffected. That very lovable and honest gentleman, William McKinley, was President of the United States. His Secretary of State was one of the most honorable and able of the long series of our Secretaries of State, the Hon. John Hay. I believe Mr. Hay, if he had seen any way to accomplish more than he did accomplish, would have attempted to accomplish it, but this is all that the administration of Mr. McKinley attempted: They did not even protest against this compulsory granting to Germany of the best part of a rich Province of a helpless country, but only stipulated that the Germans should keep it open to the trade of the United States. They did not make the least effort to save the rights of China; they only tried to save the commercial advantages of the United States. There immediately followed upon that cession to Germany a cession to Russia of Port Arthur and the region called Tallien-Wan for 25 years, with the privilege of renewing it for a similar period. When soon afterwards Japan and Russia came to blows, you remember what happened. Russia was obliged to turn over to Japan Port Arthur and Tallien-Wan, just exactly as Japan is now allowed to take over the German rights in Shantung. This Government, though the conference which determined these things was held on our own soil, did not, so far as I have been able to learn, make the slightest intimation of objecting. At the time Germany got Kaiochow Bay, England came in and said that since Germany was getting a piece of Shantung and Russia was getting Port Arthur and Tallien-Wan, she would insist upon having her slice of China, too, and the region of Wei-Hai-Wai was ceded to her. Immediately upon that France got into the unhandsome game, and there was ceded to France for 99 years one of the ports of China with the region lying behind it. In all of those transactions there was not a single attempt made by the Government of the United States to do anything except to keep those regions open to our traders.

"You now have the historic setting of the settlement about Shantung. What I want to call your attention to is that the



treaty of peace does not take Shantung from China; it takes it from Germany. There are 78 years of the 99 of that lease still to run, and not only do we not take it from China, but Japan promises in an agreement which is formally recorded, which is acknowledged by the Japanese Government, to return all the sovereign rights which Germany enjoyed in Shantung without qualification to China, and to retain nothing except what foreign corporations have throughout China, the right to run that railroad and exploit those mines. There is not a great commercial and industrial nation in Europe that does not enjoy privileges of that sort in China, and some of them enjoy them at the expense of the sovereignty of China. Japan has promised to release everything that savors of sovereignty and return it to China itself. She will have no right to put armed men anywhere into that portion of China. She will have no right to interfere with the civil administration of that portion of China. She will have no rights but economic and commercial rights. Now, if we choose to say that we will not assent to the Shantung provision, what do we do for China? Absolutely nothing. Japan has what Germany had in China in her military possession now. She has the promise of Great Britain and France that so far as they are concerned she can have it without qualification, and the only way we can take it away from Japan is by going to war with Japan and Great Britain and France.

"The league of nations for the first time provides a tribunal in which not only the sovereign rights of Germany and of Japan in China, but the sovereign rights of other nations can be curtailed, because every member of the league solemnly covenants to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members, and China is to be a member. Never before, my fellow citizens, has there been a tribunal to which people like China could carry the intolerable grievances to which they have been subjected. Now a great tribunal has been set up in which the pressure of the whole judgment of the world will be exercised in her behalf.

"That is the significance of article 10. Article 10 is the heart of the whole promise of peace, because it cuts out of the transactions of nations all attempts to impair the territorial integrity or invade the political independence of the weak as well as of the strong. Why did not Mr. Hay protest the acquisition of those rights in Shantung by Germany? Why did he not protest what England got, and what France got, and what Russia got? Because under international law, as it then stood, that would have been a hostile act toward those governments. The law of the world was actually such that if you mentioned anybody else's wrong but your own, you spoke as an enemy. After you have read article 10, read article 11. Article 11 says that it shall be the friendly right of any member of the league, strong or weak, to call the attention of the league to any matter, anywhere, that affects the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends; so that for the first time it affords fine spirits like Mr. McKinley and Mr. John Hay the right to stand up before mankind and protest, and to say, 'The rights of China shall be as sacred as the rights of those nations that are able to take care of themselves by arms.' It is the most hopeful change in the law of the world that has ever been suggested or adopted.

"But there is another subject upon which some of our fellow citizens are particularly sensitive. They say, 'What does the league of nations do for the right of self-determination?' I think I can answer that question; if not satisfactorily, at any rate very specifically. It was not within the privilege of the conference of peace to act upon the right of self-determination of any peoples except those which had been included in the territories of the defeated empires—that is to say, it was not then within their power—but the moment the covenant of the league of nations is adopted it becomes their right. If the desire for self-determination of any people in the world is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations, it becomes the business of the league; it becomes the right of any member of the league to call attention to it; it becomes the function of the league to bring the whole process of the opinion of the world to bear upon that very matter. Where before, and when before, may I ask some of my fellow countrymen who want a forum upon which to conduct a hopeful agitation, were they ever offered the opportunity to bring their case to the judgment of mankind? If they are not satisfied with that, their case is not good. The only case that you ought to bring with diffidence before the great jury of men throughout the world is the case that you can not establish. The only thing I shall ever be afraid to see the league of nations discuss, if the United States is concerned, is a case which I can hardly imagine, where the United States is wrong, because I have the hopeful and confident expectation that whenever a case in which the United States is affected is brought to the consideration of that great

body we need have no nervousness as to the elements of the argument so far as we are concerned. The glory of the United States is that it never claimed anything to which it was not justly entitled.

"I look forward with a quickened pulse to the days that lie ahead of us as a member of the league of nations, for we shall be a member of the league of nations—I look forward with confidence and with exalted hope to the time when we can indeed legitimately and constantly be the champions and friends of those who are struggling for right anywhere in the world, and no nation is likely to forget, my fellow citizens, that behind the moral judgment of the United States resides the overwhelming force of the United States. We were respected in those old Revolutionary days when there were three millions of us. We are, it happens, very much more respected, now that there are more than a hundred million of us. Now that we command some of the most important resources of the world, back of the majesty of the United States lies the strength of the United States. If Germany had ever dreamed, when she conceived her ungodly enterprise, that the United States would have come into the war, she never would have dared to attempt it.

"But now, my fellow citizens, the hope of Germany has revived. The hope of Germany has revived, because in the debates now taking place in the United States she sees a hope of at last doing what her arms could not do—dividing the United States from the great nations with which it was associated in the war. Here is a quotation from a recent utterance of one of her counsellors of state:

"All humanity, Germany particularly, is tensely awaiting the decision of the American Senate on the peace treaty,' ex-Minister of State von Scheller Steinwartz said to-day. 'Apparently'—out of respect for him I will not mention the name that that ex-Minister Steinwartz mentions—'apparently Senator Blank is the soul of the opposition. The Senator is no German hater. He hates all non-Americans equally, and he is absolutely a just man of almost Quakerlike moral strength.' How delightful to receive such praise from such a source! 'When he and other important Senators fight the peace treaty, their course means that the treaty displeases them because in the excessive enslavement of Germany, for which America would be forever responsible, they see grave danger of future complications. That course is thus to be hailed like the morning red of a new dawn.' A new dawn for the world? Oh, no; a new dawn for Germany. 'There is promise of a still better realization of conditions in the prospect that America, in all seriousness, may express the wish for a separate peace with the Central Powers.'

"A separate peace with the Central Empires could accomplish nothing but our eternal disgrace, and I would like, if my voice could reach him, to let this German counsellor know that the red he sees upon the horizon is not the red of a new dawn, but the red of a consuming fire which will consume everything like the recent purposes of the Central Empires. It is not without significance, my fellow citizens, that coincidentally with this debate with regard to the ratification of this treaty the whole pro-German propaganda has shown its head all over the United States. I would not have you understand me to mean that the men who are opposing the ratification of the treaty are consciously encouraging the pro-German propaganda. I have no right to say that or to think it, but I do say that what they are doing is encouraging the pro-German propaganda, and that it is bringing about a hope in the minds of those whom we have just spent our precious blood to defeat that they may separate us from the rest of the world and produce this interesting spectacle, only two nations standing aside from the great concert and guaranty of peace—beaten Germany and triumphant America.

"See what can be accomplished by that. By that the attitude of the rest of the world toward America will be exactly what its recent attitude was toward Germany, and we will be in the position absolutely alien to every American conception, of playing a lone hand in the world for our selfish advantage and aggrandizement. The thing is inconceivable. The thing is intolerable. The thing can and will never happen.

"I speak of these things in order that you may realize, my fellow citizens, the solemnity and the significance of this debate in which we are engaged; its solemnity because it involves the honor of the United States and the peace of humanity; its significance because, whether gentlemen plan it or not, not only refusal on our part, but long hesitation on our part to cast our fortunes permanently in with the fortunes of those who love right and liberty will be to bring mankind again into the shadow of that valley of death from which we have just emerged. I was saying to some of your fellow citizens to-day how touching it had been to me as I came across the continent to have women whom I subsequently learned had lost their sons or their hus-



bands come and take my hand and say, 'God bless you, Mr. President.' Why should they say 'God bless' me? I advised the Congress of the United States to take the action which sent their sons to their death. As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, I ordered their sons to their death. Why should they take my hand and with tears upon their cheeks say, 'God bless you'? Because they understood, as I understood, as their sons who are dead upon the fields of France understood, that they had gone there to fight for a great cause, and, above all else, they had gone there to see that in subsequent generations women should not have to mourn their dead. And as little children have gathered at every station in playful light-heartedness about the train upon which I was traveling, I have felt as if I were trustee for them. I have felt that this errand that I am going about upon was to save them the infinite sorrows through which the world has just passed, and that if by any evil counsel or unhappy mischance this great enterprise for which we fought should fail, then women with boys at their breasts ought now to weep, because when those lads come to maturity the great battle will have to be fought over again.

"And, my fellow citizens, there is another battle of which we are now upon the eve. That is the battle for the right organization of industrial society. I do not need to tell an audience in this great, progressive State what I mean by that. We can not work out justice in our communities if the world is to continue under arms and ready for war. We must have peace, we must have leisure of mind and detachment of purpose, if we are going to work out the great reforms for which mankind is everywhere waiting. I pray God that normal times may not much longer be withheld from us. The world is profoundly stirred. The masses of men are stirred by thoughts which never moved them before. We must not again go into the camp. We must sit down at the council table and, like men and brethren, lovers of liberty and justice, see that the right is done, see that the right is done to those who bear the heat and burden of the day, as well as to those who direct the labor of mankind. I am not a partisan of any party to any of these contests, and I am not an enemy of anybody except the minority that tries to control. I do not care where the minority is drawn from, I do not care how influential or how insignificant, I do not care which side of the labor question it has been on, if the power of the United States under my direction can prevent the domination of a minority, it will be prevented. I am a champion of that sort of peace, that sort of order, that sort of calm counsel out of which, and out of which alone, can come the satisfactory solutions of the problems of society. You can not solve the problems of society amidst chaos, disorder, and strife. You can only solve them when men have agreed to be calm, agreed to be just, agreed to be conciliatory, agreed that the right of the weak is as majestic as the right of the strong; and when we have come to that mind in the counsels of nations we can then more readily come to that mind in our domestic counsels, upon which the happiness and prosperity of our own beloved people so intimately and directly depend.

"I beg, my fellow citizens, that you will carry this question home with you, not in little pieces, not with this, that, and the other detail at the front in your mind, but as a great picture including the whole of the Nation and the whole of humanity, and know that now is the golden hour when America can at last prove that all she has promised in the day of her birth was no dream but a thing which she saw in its concrete reality, the rights of men, the prosperity of nations, the majesty of justice, and the sacredness of peace."

THE PRESIDENT AT LUNCHEON, PALACE HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, SEPTEMBER 18, 1919.

"Mr. Toastmaster, my fellow countrymen, I stood here yesterday, but before a very different audience, an audience that it was very delightful to address, and it is no less delightful to find myself face to face with this thoughtful group of citizens of one of the most progressive States in the Union. Because, after all, my fellow citizens, our thought must be of the present and the future. The men who do not look forward now are of no further service to the Nation. The immediate need of this country and of the world is peace not only, but settled peace, peace upon a definite and well-understood foundation, supported by such covenants as men can depend upon, supported by such purposes as will permit of a concert of action throughout all the free peoples of the world. The very interesting remarks of your toastmaster have afforded me the opportunity to pay the tribute which they earn to the gentlemen with whom I was associated on the other side of the water. I do not believe that we often enough stop to consider how remarkable the peace conference in Paris has been. It is the first great international conference which did not meet to consider the interests and advantages of

the strong nations. It is the first international conference that did not convene in order to make the arrangements which would establish the control of the strong. I want to testify that the whole spirit of the conference was the spirit of men who do not regard themselves as the masters of anybody, but as the servants of the people whom they represent. I found them quick with sympathy for the peoples who had been through all these dolorous ages imposed upon, upon whom the whole yoke of civilization seemed to have been fastened so that it never could be taken off again.

"The heart of this treaty, my fellow citizens, is that it gives liberty and independence to people who never could have got it for themselves, because the men who constituted that conference realized that the basis of war was the imposition of the will of strong nations upon those who could not resist them. You have only to take the formula of the recent war in order to see what was the matter. The formula of Pan-Germanism was Bremen to Bagdad. What is the line from Bremen to Bagdad? It leads through partitioned Poland, through prostrated Roumania, through subjugated Slavia, down through disordered Turkey, and on into distressed Persia, and every foot of the line is a line of political weakness. Germany was looking for the line of least resistance to establish her power, and unless the world makes that a line of absolute resistance, this war will have to be fought over again. You must settle the difficulties which gave occasion to the war or you must expect war again. You know what had happened all through that territory. Almost everywhere there were German princes planted on thrones where they did not belong, where they were alien, where they were of a different tradition and a different people, mere agents of a political plan, the seething center of which was that unhappy city of Constantinople, where, I dare say, there was more intrigue to the square inch than there has ever been anywhere else in the world, and where not the most honest minds always but generally the most adroit minds were sent to play upon the cupidity of the Turkish authorities and upon the helplessness of the Balkan States, in order to make a field for European aggression. I am not now saying that Germany was the only intriguer. I am not now saying that hers was the only plans of advantage, but I am saying that there was the field where lay the danger of the world in regard to peace. Every statesman in Europe knew it, and at last it dawned upon them that the remedy was not balances of power but liberty and right.

"An illumination of profound understanding of human affairs shines upon the deliberations of that conference that never shone upon the deliberations of any other international conference in history, and therefore it is a happy circumstance to me to be afforded the opportunity to say how delightful it was to find that these gentlemen had not accepted the American specifications for the peace—for you remember they were the American specifications—because America had come in and assisted them and because America was powerful and they desired her influence and assistance, but because they already believed in them. When we uttered our principles, the principles for which we were fighting, they had only to examine the thoughts of their own people to find that those were also the principles for which their people were fighting as well as the people of the United States; and the delightful enthusiasm which showed itself in accomplishing some of the most disinterested tasks of the peace was a notable circumstance of the whole conference. I was glad after I inaugurated it that I drew together the little body which was called the big four. We did not call it the big four; we called it something very much bigger than that. We called it the supreme council of the principal allied and associated powers. We had to have some name, and the more dramatic it was the better; but it was a very simple council of friends. The intimacies of that little room were the center of the whole peace conference, and they were the intimacies of men who believed in the same things and sought the same objects. The hearts of men like Clemenceau and Lloyd-George and Orlando beat with the people of the world as well as with the people of their own countries. They have the same fundamental sympathies that we have, and they know that there is only one way to work out peace and that is to work out right.

"The peace of the world is absolutely indispensable to us, and immediately indispensable to us. There is not a single domestic problem that can be worked out in the right temper or opportunely and in time unless we have conditions that we can count on. I do not need to tell business men that they can not conduct their business if they do not know what is going to happen to-morrow. You can not make plans unless you have certain elements in the future upon which you can depend. You can not seek markets unless you know whether you are going to seek them among people who suspect you or people who believe in you. If the United States is going to stand off and play truant in this



great enterprise of justice and right, then you must expect to be looked upon with suspicion and hostile rivalry everywhere in the world. They will say, 'These men are not intending to assist; they are intending to exploit us.' You know what happened just a few months before we went into the war. There was a conference at Paris consisting of representatives of the principal allied powers for the purpose of concerting a sort of economic league in which they would manage their purchasing as well as their selling in a way which would redound to their advantage and make use of the rest of the world. That was because they then thought what they will be obliged to think again if we do not continue our partnership with them—that we were standing off to get what we could out of it, and they were making a defensive economic arrangement. Very well; they will do that again. Almost of instinct they will do it again, not out of a deliberate hostility to the United States but by the general instinctive impulse of their own business interest and their own business men. Therefore we can not arrange a single element of our business until we have settled peace and know whether we are going to deal with a friendly world or an unfriendly world.

"We can not determine our own internal economic reforms until then, and there must be some very fundamental economic reforms in this country. There must be a reconsideration of the structure of our economic society. Whether we will or no, the majority of mankind demand it, in America as well as elsewhere, and we have got to sit down in the best temper possible, in times of quiet, in times permitting conciliation and not hostility, and determine what we are going to do. We can not do it until we have peace. We can not release the great industrial and economic power of America and let it run free until there are channels that are free in which it can run. And the channels of business are mental channels as well as physical channels. In an open market men's minds must be open. It has been said so often that it is a very trite saying, but it remains nevertheless true, that a financial panic is a mere state of mind. There are no fewer resources in a country at the time of a panic than there were the day before it broke. There is no less money, there is no less energy, there is no less individual capacity and initiative, but something has frightened everybody and credits are drawn in and everybody builds a fence around himself and is careful to keep behind the fence and wait and see what is going to happen. That is a panic. It is a waiting, a fearful expecting of something to happen. Generally it does not happen. Generally men slowly get their breath again and say, 'Well, the world looks just the same as it did; we had better get to work again.' Even when business is absolutely prostrate they are at least in the condition that a friend of mine described. He was asked at the time of one of our greatest panics, some 25 years ago, if business was not looking up. He said, 'Yes; it is so flat on its back that it can not look any other way.' Even if it is flat on its back, it can see the world; it is not lying on its face, and it will presently sit up and begin to take a little nourishment and take notice, and the panic is over. But while the whole world is in doubt what to expect, the whole world is under the partial paralysis that is characteristic of a panic. You do not know what it is safe to do with your money now. You do not know what plans it is safe to make for your business now. You have got to know what the world of tomorrow is going to be, and you will not know until we have settled the great matter of peace.

"I want to remind you how the permanency of peace is at the heart of this treaty. This is not merely a treaty of peace with Germany. It is a world settlement; not affecting those parts of the world, of course, which were not involved in the war, because the conference had no jurisdiction over them, but the war did extend to most parts of the world, and the scattered, dismembered assets of the Central Empires and of Turkey gave us plenty to do and covered the greater part of the distressed populations of the world. It is nothing less than a world settlement, and at the center of that stands this covenant for the future which we call the covenant of the league of nations. Without it the treaty can not be worked, and without it it is a mere temporary arrangement with Germany. The covenant of the league of nations is the instrumentality for the maintenance of peace.

"How does it propose to maintain it? By the means that all forward-looking and thoughtful men have desired for generations together, by substituting arbitration and discussion for war. To hear some gentlemen talk you would think that the council of the league of nations is to spend its time considering when to advise other people to fight. That is what comes of a constant concentration of attention upon article 10. Article 10 ought to have been somewhere further down in the covenant, because it is in the background; it is not in the foreground. I

am going to take the liberty of expounding this to you, though I assume that you have all read the covenant. At the heart of that covenant are these tremendous arrangements: Every member of the league solemnly agrees—and let me pause to say that that means every fighting nation in the world, because for the present, limited to an army of 100,000, Germany is not a fighting nation—that it will never go to war without first having done one or another of two things, without either submitting the matter in dispute to arbitration, in which case it promises absolutely to abide by the verdict, or, if it does not care to submit it to arbitration, without submitting it to discussion by the council of the league of nations, in which case it promises to lay all the documents and all the pertinent facts before that council; it consents that that council shall publish all the documents and all the pertinent facts, so that all the world shall know them; that it shall be allowed six months in which to consider the matter; and that even at the end of the six months, if the decision of the council is not acceptable, it will still not go to war for three months following the rendering of the decision. So that, even allowing no time for the preliminaries, there are nine months of cooling off, nine months of discussion, nine months not of private discussion, not of discussion between those who are heated, but of discussion between those who are disinterested except in the maintenance of the peace of the world, when the purifying and rectifying influence of the public opinion of mankind is brought to bear upon the contest. If anything approaching that had been the arrangement of the world in 1914, the war would have been impossible; and I confidently predict that there is not an aggressive people in the world who would dare bring a wrongful purpose to that jury. It is the most formidable jury in the world. Personally, I have never, so far as I know, been in danger of going to jail, but I would a great deal rather go to jail than do wrong and be punished merely by the look in the eyes of the men amongst whom I circulated. I would rather go to jail than be sent to Coventry. I would rather go to jail than be conscious every day that I was despised and distrusted. After all, the only overwhelming force in the world is the force of opinion.

"If any member of the league ignores these promises with regard to arbitration and discussion, what happens? War? No; not war, but something more tremendous, I take leave to say, than war. An absolute isolation, a boycott. It is provided in the covenant that any nation that disregards these solemn promises with regard to arbitration and discussion shall be thereby deemed ipso facto to have committed an act of war against the other members of the league, and that there shall thereupon follow an absolute exclusion of that nation from communication of any kind with the members of the league. No goods can be shipped in or out; no telegraphic messages can be exchanged, except through the elusive wireless perhaps; there shall be no communication of any kind between the people of the other nations and the people of that nation. There is not a nation in Europe that can stand that for six months. Germany could have faced the armies of the world more readily than she faced the boycott of the world. Germany felt the pinch of the blockade more than she felt the stress of the blow; and there is not, so far as I know, a single European country—I say European because I think our own country is an exception—which is not dependent upon some other part of the world for some of the necessities of its life. Some of them are absolutely dependent, some of them are without raw materials practically of any kind, some of them are absolutely without fuel of any kind, either coal or oil; almost all of them are without that variety of supply of ores which are necessary to modern industry and necessary to the manufacture of munitions of war. When you apply that boycott, you have got your hand upon the throat of the offending nation, and it is a proper punishment. It is an exclusion from civilized society.

"Inasmuch as I have sometimes been said to have been very disregarding of the constitutional rights of Congress, may I not stop to speak just for a moment of a small matter that I was punctilious to attend to in regard to that article? You will notice the language that any member of the league that makes breach of its covenants shall be regarded as thereby 'ipso facto' to have committed an act of war.' In the original draft it read, 'Shall thereby be ipso facto regarded as at war with the other nations of the world.' I said, 'No; I can not subscribe to that, because I am bound to safeguard the right of Congress to determine whether it is at war or not. I consent to its being an act of war by the party committing it, but whether Congress takes up the gage thus thrown down or not is another matter in which I can not participate in determining in a document of this sort.' Germany committed several acts of war against us before we accepted the inevitable and took up her challenge, and it was only because of a sort of accumulation of evidence that Ger-



many's design was not merely to sink American ships and injure American citizens, that was incidental to her design, but that her design was to destroy free political society. I remember saying to Congress before we went into the war that if Germany committed some act of war against us that was intolerable, I might have to give them different advice, and I remember a newspaper correspondent asked me what I thought would constitute such an act. I said, 'I don't know, but I am perfectly certain I will know it when I see it. I can not hypothetically define it, but it will be perfectly obvious when it occurs.' And if Congress regards this act by some other member of the league as such an act of war against it as necessitates the maintenance of the honor of the United States, then it may in those circumstances declare war, but it is not bound to declare war under the engagement of the covenant. What I am emphasizing, my fellow citizens, is this: That the heart of this covenant is arbitration and discussion, and that is the only possible basis for peace in the future.

"It is a basis for something better than peace. Civilization proceeds on the principle of understanding one another. You know peace between those who employ labor and those who labor depends upon conference and mutual understanding. If you do not get together with the other side, it will be hostility to the end; and after you have heard the case of the other fellow it sometimes becomes a little awkward for you to insist upon the whole of your case, because the human mind does have this fine quality—that it finds it embarrassing to face the truth and deny it. Moreover, the basis of friendship is intercourse. I know—I am very fond of—a very large number of men whom I know to be crooks. They are very engaging fellows, and when I form a judgment against them I have to be in another room. I can not, because of my personal attitude toward them, form a harsh judgment; indeed, I suppose the very thing that gives some men the chance to be crooks is their fascinating personality. They put it over on you. You remember that very charming remark of Charles Lamb. One night, in company with some friends who were speaking of some person not present, Lamb, in his stuttering fashion, said, 'I—I—I h—hate that fellow.' Some one said, 'Why, Charles, I didn't know you knew him.' 'Oh, I—I d—d—don't,' he said, 'I—I c—can't h—h—hate a m—man I—I know.' That is one of the most genial utterances of the human spirit I have ever read, and one of the truest. It is mighty hard to hate a fellow you know, and it is mighty hard to hate a nation you know. If you had mixed, as I have had the good fortune to mix, with scores of people of other nations in recent months, you would have the same feeling that I do if, after you got over superficial matters like differences of language and some differences of manner, they were the same kind of folks.

"As I have said to a number of audiences on this trip, the most thrilling thing that happened to me over there was the constant intercourse I was having with delegations of people representing nations from all over the globe, some of which, I had shamefacedly to admit, I had never heard of before. Do you know where Adjur-Badjan is? Well, one day there came in a very dignified and interesting group of gentlemen from Adjur-Badjan. I did not have time until they were gone to find out where they came from, but I did find this out immediately, that I was talking to men who talked the same language that I did in respect of ideas, in respect of conceptions of liberty, in respect of conceptions of right and justice, and I did find this out, that they were, with all the other delegations that came to see me, metaphorically speaking, holding their hands out to America and saying, 'You are the disciples and leaders of the free peoples of the world; can't you come and help us?' Until we went into this war, my fellow citizens, it was the almost universal impression of the world that our idealism was a mere matter of words; that what we were interested in was getting on in the world and making as much as we could out of it. That was the sum and substance of the usual opinion of us outside of America; and in the short space that we were in this war that opinion was absolutely reversed.

"Consider what they saw: The flower of our youth sent three and four thousand miles away from their home, a home which could not be directly touched by the flames of that war, sent to foreign fields to mix with foreign and alien armies to fight for a cause which they recognized as the common cause of mankind, and not the peculiar cause of America. It caused a revulsion of feeling, a revulsion of attitude which, I dare say, has never been paralleled in the world; and at this moment, unless the cynical counsels of some of our acquaintances should prevail—which God forbid—they are expecting and inviting us to lead the civilized world, because they trust us—they really and truly trust us. They would not believe, no matter where we

sent an army to be of assistance to them, that we would ever use that army for any purpose but to assist them. They know that when we say, as we said when we sent men to Siberia, that we are sending them to assist in the distribution of food and clothing and shoes so that brigands will not seize them, and that for the rest we are ready to render any assistance which they want us to render, and will interfere in absolutely nothing that concerns their own affairs, we mean it, and they believe us. There is not a place in this world now, unless we wait a little while longer, where America's political ambitions are looked upon with suspicion. That was frankly admitted in this little conference that I have spoken of. Not one of those gentlemen thought that America had any ulterior designs whatever. They were, therefore, in all our conferences, in consulting our economical experts, in consulting our geographical experts, constantly turning to America to act as umpire; and in nine cases out of ten, just because America was disinterested and could look at the thing without any other purpose than reaching a practicable solution, it was the American solution that was accepted.

"In order that we may not forget, I brought with me the figures as to what this war meant to the world. This is a body of business men and you will understand these figures. They are too big for the imagination of men who do not handle big things. Here is the cost of the war in money, exclusive of what we loaned one another: Great Britain and her dominions, \$38,000,000,000; France, \$26,000,000,000; the United States, \$22,000,000,000 (this is the direct cost of our operations); Russia, \$18,000,000,000; Italy, \$13,000,000,000; and the total, including Belgium, Japan, and other countries, \$123,000,000,000. This is what it cost the Central Powers: Germany, \$39,000,000,000, the biggest single item; Austria-Hungary, \$21,000,000,000; Turkey and Bulgaria, \$3,000,000,000; a total of \$63,000,000,000, and a grand total of direct war costs of \$186,000,000,000—almost the capital of the world. The expenditures of the United States were at the rate of \$1,000,000 an hour for two years, including nighttime with daytime. The battle deaths during the war were as follows: Russia lost in dead 1,700,000 men, poor Russia that got nothing but terror and despair out of it all; Germany, 1,600,000; France, 1,385,000; Great Britain, 900,000; Austria, 800,000; Italy, 364,000; the United States, 50,300 dead. The total for all the belligerents, 7,450,200 men—just about seven and a half million killed because we could not have arbitration and discussion, because the world had never had the courage to propose the conciliatory methods which some of us are now doubting whether we ought to accept or not. The totals for wounded are not obtainable except our own. Our own wounded were 230,000, excluding those who were killed. The total of all battle deaths in all the wars of the world from the year 1793 to 1914 was something under 6,000,000 men, so that about a million and a half more men were killed in this war than in all the wars of something more than 100 preceding years. We really can not realize that. Those of us who lost sons or brothers can realize it. We know what it meant. The women who have little children crowding about their knees know what it means; they know that the world has hitherto been devoted to brutal methods of settlement, and that every time a war occurs it is the flower of the manhood that is destroyed; that it is not so much the present generation as the next generation that goes maimed off the stage or is laid away in obscure graves upon some battle field; and that great nations are impaired in their vitality for two generations together and all their life embittered by a method of settlement for which we could find, and have now found, a substitute.

"My fellow citizens, I believe in Divine Providence. If I did not, I would go crazy. If I thought the direction of the disordered affairs of this world depended upon our finite intelligence, I should not know how to reason my way to sanity, and I do not believe that there is any body of men, however they concert their power or their influence, that can defeat this great enterprise, which is the enterprise of divine mercy and peace and good will."

THE PRESIDENT AT BERKELEY, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 15, 1919.

"Dean Jones, Mr. Mayor, ladies and gentlemen, I feel an old feeling come over me as I stand in this presence, and my great danger and temptation is to revert to type and talk to you as college men and women from a college man. I was reminded as I received your very generous welcome of a story told of Mr. Oliver Herford, a very delightful wit and artist. He was one day sitting in his club, and a man came by who did not know him very well, but who took many liberties. He slapped him on the back and said, 'Hello, Ollie, old boy, how are you?' Herford writhed a little under the blow, looked at him a little coldly, and said: 'I don't know your name; I don't know your



face; but your manners are very familiar.' I can say to you young ladies and gentlemen, I do not know your names or your faces, but your manners are very familiar, and very delightfully familiar. I think also of a rebuke I used often to address to my classes. I used to say that the trouble about the college youth of America was that it refused to grow up; that the men and women alike continued to be schoolboys and schoolgirls. I used to remind them that on the continent of Europe revolutions often began in the universities, and statesmen were nervous of nothing so much as of the concerted movements of opinion at the centers of learning; and I asked them what Cabinet at Washington ever cared a peppercorn what they were thinking about. It is your refusal, my fellow students, to grow up. One reason I am glad to see that the boys who have been at the front come back is that they have grown up; they have seen the world; seen it at its worst, but nevertheless seen it in action; seen it with its passions in action; seen it with its savage and its liberal passions in action. They have come back to know what they are preparing for, to know the kind of world that they are going to go out in, not to do physical fighting, but to do the kind of thinking that is better than fighting, the kind of thinking that makes men conscious of their duties, the kind of thinking that purifies the impulses of the world and leads it on to better things.

"The burden that is upon my heart as I go about on this errand is that men are hesitating to give us the chance. We can not do any effective thinking for the world until we know that there is settled peace. We can not make any long plans for the betterment of mankind until these initial plans are made, and we know that there is going to be a field and an opportunity to make the plans that will last and that will become effective. That is the ground of my impatience with the debate. I admit that there are debatable things, but I do not admit that they need be debated so long. Not only that, but I do insist that they should be debated more fairly. A remark was repeated to me that was made after the address I made in San Francisco last night. Some man said that after hearing an exposition of what was really in the treaty he was puzzled; he wondered what the debate was about; it all seemed so simple. That was not, I need not assure you, because I was misleading anybody or telling what was not in the treaty, but because the men he had heard debate it, some of the newspapers he had heard debate it, had not told him what was in the treaty. This great document of human rights, this great settlement of the world, had been represented to him as containing little traps for the United States. Men had been going about dwelling upon this, that, and the other feature and distorting the main features and saying that that was the peace proposed. They are responsible for some of the most serious mistakes that have ever been made in the history of this country; they are responsible for misleading the opinion of the United States. It is a very distressing circumstance to me to find that when I recite the mere facts they are novel to some of my fellow citizens. Young gentlemen and young ladies, what we have got to do is to see that that sort of thing can not happen. We have got to know what the truth is and insist that everybody shall know what the truth is, and, above all things else, we must see that the United States is not defeated of its destiny, for its destiny is to lead the world in freedom and in truth."

THE PRESIDENT AT AUDITORIUM, OAKLAND, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 18, 1919.

"Dr. Rhinehart, my fellow citizens, you have indeed warmed my heart with your splendid welcome and I esteem it a great privilege to stand here before you to-night to look at some of the serious aspects of the great turning point in the history of this Nation and the history of the world which affairs have brought us to. Dr. Rhinehart expressed my own feeling when she said that in my own consciousness those great ranks of little children seemed to me my real clients, seemed to be that part of my fellow citizens for whom I am pleading. It is not likely, my fellow citizens, that with the depleted resources of the great fighting nations of Europe, there will be another war soon, but unless we concert measures to prevent it, there will be another and a final war, at just about the time these children come to maturity; and it is our duty to look in the face the real circumstances of the world in order that we may not be unfaithful to the great duty which America undertook in the hour and day of her birth.

"One thing has been impressed upon me more than another as I have crossed the continent, and that is that the people of the United States have been singularly, and I sometimes fear deliberately, misled as to the character and contents of the treaty of peace. Some one told me that after an address I delivered in San Francisco last night one of the men who had

been present, a very thoughtful man, I was told, said that after listening to what I had said he wondered what the debate was about, it all seemed so simple, so obvious, so natural. I was at once led to reflect that that was not the cause of any gift of exposition that I have, but because I had told that audience what the real character and purpose of the covenant of nations are. They had been led to look at certain incidental features of it, either on the assumption that they had not read the document or in the hope that they would not read it, and would not realize what the real contents of it were. I have not come out from Washington, my fellow citizens, on a speech-making tour. I do not see how anybody could get his own consent to think of the way in which he was saying the things that it is necessary for me to say. I should think that every man's consciousness would be fixed, as my own is, upon the critical destiny of the world which hangs upon the decision of America. I am confident what that decision is going to be because I can see the tide of sentiment and the tide of conviction rising in this country in such a manner that any man who tries to withstand it will be overwhelmed. But we are an intelligent and thoughtful people; we want to know just what it is that we are about, and if you will be patient with me I am going to try to point out some of the things I did not dwell upon last night that are the salient and outstanding characteristics of this treaty.

"I am not going to speak to-night particularly of the covenant of the league of nations. I am going to point out to you what the treaty as a whole is. In the first place, of course, that treaty imposes upon Germany the proper penalty for the crime she attempted to commit. It is a just treaty in spite of its severity. It is a treaty made by men who had no intention of crushing the German people, but who did mean to have it burnt into the consciousness of the German people, and through their consciousness into the apprehension of the world, that no people could afford to live under a Government which was not controlled by their purpose and will and which was at liberty to impose secret ambitions upon the civilization of the world. It was intended as notice to all mankind that any Government that attempted what Germany attempted would meet with the same concerted opposition of mankind and would have meted out to it the same just retribution. All that this treaty amounts to, so far as Germany is concerned, is that she shall be obliged to pay every dollar that she can afford to pay to repair the damage that she did; except for the territorial arrangements which it includes, that is practically the whole of the treaty so far as it concerns Germany. What has not been borne in upon the consciousness of some of our people is that, although most of the words of the treaty are devoted to the settlement with Germany, the greater part of the meaning of its provisions is devoted to the settlement of the world.

"The treaty begins with the covenant of the league of nations, which is intended to operate as a partnership, a permanent partnership, of the great and free self-governing peoples of the world to stand sponsor for the right and for civilization. Notice is given in the very first articles of the treaty that hereafter it will not be a matter of conjecture whether the other great nations of the world will combine against a wrongdoer, but a matter of certainty that hereafter nations contemplating what the Government of Germany contemplated will not have to conjecture whether Great Britain and France and Italy and the great United States will join hands against them, but will know that mankind, in serried ranks, will defend to the last the rights of human beings wherever they are. This is the first treaty ever framed by such an international convention, whose object was not to serve and defend governments but to serve and defend peoples. This is the first people's treaty in the history of international dealings. Every member of that great convention of peace was poignantly aware that at last the people of the world were awake, that at last the people of the world were aware of what wrong had been wrought by irresponsible and autocratic governments, that at last all the peoples of the world had seen the vision of liberty, had seen the majesty of justice, had seen the doors thrown open to the aspirations of men and women and the fortunes of children everywhere, and they did not dare assume that they were the masters of the fortunes of any people, but knew that in every settlement they must act as the servants not only of their own people but of the people who were waiting to be liberated, the people who could not win their own liberty, the people who had suffered for centuries together the intolerable wrongs of misgovernment. This is a treaty not merely for the peoples who were represented at the peace table but for the people who were the subjects of the governments whose wrongs were forever ended by the victory on the fields of France.

"My fellow citizens, you know and you hear it said every day, you read it in the newspapers, you hear it in the conver-



sation of your friends, that there is unrest all over the world. You hear that in every part of the world, not excluding our own beloved country, there are men who feel that society has been shaken to its foundations, and that it ought to have been shaken to its foundations, in order that men might be awakened to the wrongs that had been done and were continuing to be done. When you look into the history, not of our own free and fortunate continent, happily, but of the rest of the world, you will find that the hand of pitiless power has been upon the shoulders of the great mass of mankind since time began, and that only with that glimmer of light which came at Calvary, that first dawn which came with the Christian era, did men begin to wake to the dignity and right of the human soul, and that in spite of professions of Christianity, in spite of purposes of reform, in spite of theories of right and of justice, the great body of our fellow beings have been kept under the will of men who exploited them and did not give them the full right to live and realize the purposes that God had meant them to realize. There is little for the great part of the history of the world except the bitter tears of pity and the hot tears of wrath, and when you look, as we were permitted to look in Paris, into some of the particular wrongs which the peoples of Central Europe, the peoples upon whom the first foundations of the new German power were to be built, had suffered for generations together, you wonder why they lay so long quiet, you wonder why men, statesmen, men who pretended to have an outlook upon the world, waited so long to deliver them. The characteristic of this treaty is that it gives liberty to peoples who never could have won it for themselves. By giving that liberty, it limits the ambitions and defeats the hopes of all the imperialistic governments in the world. Governments which had theretofore been considered to desire dominion, here in this document forswore dominion, renounced it, said, 'The fundamental principle upon which we are going to act is this, that every great territory of the world belongs to the people who live in it, and that is their right, and not our right, to determine the sovereignty they shall live under and the form of government they shall maintain.' It is astonishing that this great document did not come as a shock upon the world. If the world had not already been rent by the great struggle which preceded this settlement, men would have stood at amaze at such a document as this; but there is a subtle consciousness throughout the world now that this is an end of governing people who do not desire the government that is over them.

"And, going further than that, the makers of the treaty proceeded to arrange, upon a cooperative basis, those things which had always been arranged before upon a competitive basis. I want to mention a very practical thing, which most of you, I dare say, never thought about. Most of the rivers of Europe traverse the territory of several nations, and up to the time of this peace conference there had been certain historic rights and certain treaty rights over certain parts of the courses of those rivers which had embarrassed the people who lived higher up upon the stream; just as if the great Mississippi, for example, passed through half a dozen States and the people down at New Orleans lived under a government which could control the navigation of the lower part of the Mississippi and so hamper the commerce of the States above them to the north which wished to pass to the sea by the courses of the Mississippi. There were abundant instances of that sort in Europe, and this treaty undertakes to internationalize all the great waterways of that Continent, to see to it that their several portions are taken out of national control and put under international control, so that the stream that passes through one nation shall be just as free in all its length to the sea as if that nation owned the whole of it, and nobody shall have the right to put a restriction upon their passage to the sea. I mention this in order to illustrate the heart of this treaty, which is to cut out national privilege and give to every people the full right attaching to the territory in which they live.

"Then the treaty did something more than that. You have heard of the covenant of the league of nations until, I dare say, you suppose that is the only thing in the treaty. On the contrary, there is a document almost as extensive in the latter part of the treaty which is nothing less than a great charter of liberty for the working men and women of the world. One of the most striking and useful provisions of the treaty is that every member of the league of nations undertakes to advance the humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children, to consider the interests of labor under its own jurisdiction, and to try to extend to every nation with which it has any dealings the standards of labor upon which it itself insists; so that America, which has by no means yet reached the standards in those matters which we must and shall reach, but which, nevertheless, is the most advanced in the world in respect of the

conditions of labor, undertakes to bring all the influence it can legitimately to bear upon every nation with which it has any dealings to see that labor there is put upon as good a footing as labor in America. Perhaps some of you have not kept in mind the seamen's act which was passed in a recent session of Congress. Under the law before that act, seamen could be bound to the service of their ship in such fashion that when they came to the ports of the United States, if they tried to leave their ship, the Government of the United States was bound to arrest them and send them back to their ship. The seamen's act abrogates that law and practically makes it necessary for every ship that would take away from the United States the crew that it brings to it shall pay American wages to get it. Before this treaty was entered into the United States had entered upon the business of trying to extend to laboring men elsewhere the advantages which laboring men in the United States enjoy, and supplementing that promise in the covenant of the league there is an elaborate arrangement for a periodic international conference in the interest of labor. It provides that that conference shall be called next month in the city of Washington by the President of the United States, and the President of the United States has already called it. We are awaiting to learn from the Senate of the United States whether we can attend it or not. We can at least sit and listen and wonder how long we are going to be kept out of membership of this great humane endeavor to see that working men and women and children everywhere in the world are regarded as human beings and taken care of as they ought to be taken care of.

"This treaty does not stop there. It attempts to coordinate all the great humane endeavors of the world. It tries to bring under international cooperation every effort to check international crime. I mean like that unspeakable traffic in women, like that almost equally unspeakable traffic in children. It undertakes to control the dealing in deadly drugs like opium. It organizes a new method of cooperation among all the great Red Cross societies of the world. I tell you, my fellow citizens, that simple red cross has come to mean to the world more than it ever meant before. Everywhere—in the remotest recesses of the world—there are people who wear that symbol, and every time I look at it I feel like taking off my hat, as if I had seen a symbol of the world's heart. This treaty is nothing less than an organization of liberty and mercy for the world. I wish you would get a copy of it and read it. A good deal of it is technical and you could skip that part, but read all of it that you do not need an expert to advise you with regard to the meaning of. The economic and financial clauses which particularly affect the settlements with Germany are, I dare say, almost unintelligible to most people, but you do not have to understand them; they are going to be worked out by experts. The rest of it is going to be worked out by the experience of free self-governed peoples.

"One of the interesting provisions of the covenant of the league of nations is that no nation can be a member of that league which is not a self-governing nation. No autocratic government can come into its membership; no government which is not controlled by the will and vote of its people. It is a league of free, independent peoples all over the world, and when that great arrangement is consummated there is not going to be a ruler in the world that does not take his advice from his people. Germany is for the present excluded, but she is excluded only in order that she may undergo a period of probation, during which she shall prove two things—first, that she has really changed her constitution permanently, and second, that she intends to administer that constitution in the spirit of its terms. You read in the newspapers that there are intrigues going on in Germany for the restoration of something like the old government, perhaps for the restoration of the throne and placing upon it some member of the family of Hohenzollern. Very well, if that should be accomplished Germany is forever excluded from the league of nations. It is not our business to say to the German people what sort of government they shall have, it is our fundamental principle that that is their business and not ours, but it is our business to say whom we will keep company with, and if Germany wishes to live in respectable society she will never have another Hohenzollern. The other day, you will notice, Hungary for a little while put one of the Austrian princes upon her throne, and the peace conference, still sitting in Paris, sent word that they could not deal with a government which had one of the Hapsburgs at its head. The Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns are permanently out of business. I dare say that they personally, from what I can learn, feel antiquated and out of date. They are out of date because, my fellow citizens, this Great War, with its triumphant issue, marks a new day in the history of the world. There can no more be any such attempts as Germany made if the great lead-



ing free people of the world lends its countenance and leadership to the enterprise. I say if, but it is a mere rhetorical if. There is not the least danger that America, after a treaty has been drawn up exactly along the specifications stipulated by America, will desert its associates. We are a people that redeems its honor. We are not, and never will be, quitters.

"You notice that one of the grounds of anxiety of a small group of our fellow citizens is whether they can get out of the league if they ever get in, and so they want to have the key put in their pockets; they want to be assigned a seat right by the door; they want to sit on the edge of their chairs and say, 'If anything happens in this meeting to which I am in the least sensitive, I leave.' That, my fellow citizens, is not the spirit of America. What is going to happen is this: We are not going to sit by the door; we are going to sit in the high seats, and if the present attitude of the peoples of the world toward America is any index of what it will continue to be, the counsels of the United States will be the prevailing counsels of the league. If we were humbly at the outset to sit by the door, we would be invited to go up and take the chair. I, for one, do not want to be put in the attitude of children who, when the game goes against them, will not play, because I have such an unbounded confidence in the rectitude of the purpose of the United States that I am not afraid she will ever be caught proposing something which the other nations will defeat. She did not propose anything in Paris which the other nations defeated. The only obstacles, the only insuperable obstacles, met there were obstacles which were contained in treaties of which she had no notice, in secret treaties which certain great nations were bound in honor to respect, and the covenant of the league of nations abolishes secret treaties. From this time forth all the world is going to know what all the agreements between nations are. It is going to know, not their general character merely, but their exact language and contents, because the provision of the league is that no treaty shall be valid which is not registered with the general secretary of the league, and the general secretary of the league is instructed to publish it in all its details at the earliest possible moment. Just as you can go to the courthouse and see all the mortgages on all the real estate in your county, you can go to the general secretariat of the league of nations and find all the mortgages on all the nations. This treaty, in short, is a great clearance house. It is very little short of a canceling of the past and an insurance of the future.

"Men have asked me, 'Do you think that the league of nations is an absolute guaranty against war?' Of course it is not; no human arrangement can give you an absolute guaranty against human passion, but I answer that question with another, 'If you thought you had 50 per cent insurance against war, would not you jump at it? If you thought you had 30 per cent insurance against war, would not you take it? If you thought you had 10 per cent insurance against war, would not you think it better than nothing?' Whereas, in my judgment, this is 99 per cent insurance, because the one thing that a wrong cause can not stand is exposure. If you think that you have a friend who is a fool, encourage him to hire a hall. The particular thing that this treaty provides in the covenant of the league of nations is that every cause shall be deliberately exposed to the judgment of mankind. It substitutes what the whole world has long been for, namely, arbitration and discussion for war. In other words, all the great fighting nations of the world—for Germany for the time being, at any rate, is not a great fighting nation—promise to lay their case, whatever it may be, before the whole jury of humanity. If there had been any arrangement comparable with this in 1914, the calamitous war which we have just passed through would have been inconceivable.

"Look what happened. The Austrian crown prince was assassinated inside the Austrian dominion, in Bosnia, which was under the Empire of Austria-Hungary, though it did not belong to it, and Austria had no business to have it; and because it was suspected that the assassination was connected with certain groups of agitators and certain revolutionary societies in Serbia, war was made on Serbia, because the Austrian crown prince was assassinated in Austria! Just as if some great personage were to be assassinated, let us say, in Great Britain, and because the assassin was found to have society connections—I mean certain connections with a society that had an active membership—in the United States Great Britain should declare war on the United States. That is a violently improbable supposition, but I am merely using it as an illustration. Every foreign office in Europe, when it got sudden news of what was afoot, sent messages to its representative in Berlin asking the German Government to hold an international conference to see if the matter could not be adjusted, and the German Government would not wait 24 hours. Under the treaty of the league of nations every fighting nation is bound to wait at least nine

months, and to lay all the facts pertinent to the case before the whole world. There is nothing so overpowering and irresistible, my fellow citizens, as the opinion of mankind. One of the most interesting and, I think, in one way, one of the most moving sentences in the great Declaration of Independence, is one of the opening sentences—'that out of respect to the opinion of mankind the causes which have led the people of the American Colonies to declare their independence are here set forth.' America was the first country in the world which laid before all mankind the reason why it went to war, and this treaty is the exaltation and permanent establishment of the American principle of warfare and of right. Why, therefore, do we hesitate to redeem the destiny of America? Why do we hesitate to support the most American thing that has ever been attempted? Why do we debate details when the heart of the thing is sound? And the beauty of it, my fellow citizens, is that the heart of America is sound.

"We sent our boys across the sea to beat Germany, but that was only the beginning. We sent them across the sea to assure the world that nothing such as Germany attempted should ever happen again. That is the halo that is going to be about the brows of these fine boys that have come back from overseas. That is the light that is going to rest upon the graves overseas of the boys we could not bring back. That is the glory that is going to attach to the memories of that great American Army, that it made conquest of the armies of Germany not only, but made conquest of peace for the world. Greater armies than sought the Holy Grail, greater armies than sought to redeem the Holy Sepulchre, greater armies than fought under that visionary and wonderful girl, Joan of Arc, greater than the armies of the American Revolution that sought to redeem us from the unjust rule of Britain, greater even than the armies of our Civil War which saved the Union, will be this noble army of Americans who saved the world!"

THE PRESIDENT AT STADIUM, SAN DIEGO, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 19, 1919.

"Mr. Mayor, my fellow countrymen, as you know, I have come from Washington on a very serious errand, indeed, and I need not tell you with what a thrill the sight of this great body of my fellow citizens fills my heart, because I believe that one of the most important verdicts of history has now to be rendered by the great people of the United States. I believe that this is a choice from which we can not turn back. Whether it be the choice of honor or of dishonor, it will be a final choice that we shall make in this great hour of our history.

"One of the most unexpected things that I have found on my journey is that the people of the United States have not been informed as to the real character and scope and contents of the great treaty of peace with Germany. Whether by omission or by intention, they have been directed in all of the speeches that I have read to certain points of the treaty which are incidental, and not central, and their attention has been drawn away from the real meaning of this great human document. For that, my fellow citizens, is just what it is. It not only concludes a peace with Germany and imposes upon Germany the proper penalties for the outrage she attempted upon mankind but it also concludes the peace in the spirit in which the war was undertaken by the nations opposed to Germany. The challenge of war was accepted by them not with the purpose of crushing the German people but with the purpose of putting an end once and for all to such plots against the free governments of the world as had been conceived on Wilhelmstrasse, in Berlin, unknown to the people of Germany, unconceived by them, advised by little groups of men who had the military power to carry out private ambitions.

"We went into this war not only to see that autocratic power of that sort never threatened the world again but we went into it for even larger purposes than that. Other autocratic powers may spring up, but there is only one soil in which they can spring up and that is the wrongs done to free peoples of the world. The heart and center of this treaty is that it sets at liberty people all over Europe and in Asia who had hitherto been enslaved by powers which were not their rightful sovereigns and masters. So long as wrongs like that exist in the world, you can not bring permanent peace to the world. I go further than that. So long as wrongs of that sort exist, you ought not to bring permanent peace to the world, because those wrongs ought to be righted, and enslaved peoples ought to be free to right them. For my part, I will not take any part in composing difficulties that ought not to be composed, and a difficulty between an enslaved people and its autocratic rulers ought not to be composed. We in America have stood from the day of our birth for the emancipation of people throughout the world who were living unwillingly under governments which were not of their own choice. The thing which we have held



more sacred than any other is that all just government rests upon the consent of the governed, and all over the world that principle has been disregarded, that principle has been flouted by the strong, and only the weak have suffered. The heart and center of this treaty is the principle adopted not only in this treaty but put into effect also in the treaty with Austria, in the treaty with Hungary, in the treaty with Bulgaria, in the treaty with Turkey, that every great territory in the world belongs to the people who are living on it, and that it is not the privilege of any authority anywhere—certainly not the privilege of the peace conference at Paris—to impose upon those peoples any government which they accept unwillingly and not of their own choice.

"Nations that never before saw the gleam of hope have been liberated by this great document. Pitiful Poland, divided up as spoils among half a dozen nations, is by this document united and set free. Similarly, in the treaty with Austria, the Austrian power is taken off of every people over whom it had no right to reign. You know that the great populations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which lay between Austria and the Balkan Peninsula, were unjustly under the power of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and it was in a city of Bosnia that the Crown Prince of Austria was assassinated—Bosnia which was under the power of Austria. Though Bosnia was part of Austrian territory, Austria had the audacity to hold Serbia, an outside neighbor, responsible for an act of assassination on Austrian territory, the Austrian Government choosing to believe that certain societies with which it connected the assassin, societies active in Serbia, had planned and executed the assassination. So the world was deluged in blood, and 7,400,000 men lie dead—not to speak of the pitiful wounded, not to speak of the blinded, not to speak of those with distracted brain, not to speak of all the pitiful, shattered nerves of millions of men all over the world—because of an insurgent feeling in a great population which was ruled over by rulers not of their own choice. The peace conference at Paris knew that it would not go to the root of this matter unless it destroyed power of that kind. This treaty sets those great peoples free.

"But it does not stop with that. In the heart of the treaty you will find a new charter for those who labor—men, women, and children all over the world. The heart of the world is depressed, my fellow citizens, the heart of the world is uneasy. The heart of the world is a little despairful of its future, because the economic arrangements of the world have not been just, and the people who are having unjust conditions imposed upon them are, of course, not content to live under them. When the whole world is at unrest you may be sure that there is some real cause for the unrest. It is not whimsical. Men do not disturb the foundations of their lives just to satisfy a sudden impulse. All these troubles, whatever shape they may take, whether the action taken is just or unjust, have their root in age-long wrongs which ought to be, must be, and will be righted, and this great treaty makes a beginning in that great enterprise of humanity. It provides an arrangement for recurrent and periodic international conferences, the main and sole object of which will be to improve the conditions of labor, to safeguard the lives and the health of women and children who work and whose lives would otherwise be impaired or whose health be rendered subject to all the inroads of disease. The heart of humanity beats in this document. It is not a statesman's arrangement. It is a liberation of the peoples and of the humane forces of the world, and yet I never hear the slightest intimation of any of these great features in the speeches of the gentlemen who are opposing this treaty. They never tell you what is really in this treaty. If they did your enthusiasm would sweep them off their feet. If they did they would know that it was an audacity which they had better not risk to impair the peace and the humane conditions of mankind.

"At the very front and heart of the treaty is the part which is most criticized, namely, the great covenant for a league of nations. This treaty could not be executed without such a powerful instrumentality. Unless all the right-thinking nations of the world are going to concert their purpose and their power, this treaty is not worth the paper that it is written on, because it is a treaty where peace rests upon the right of the weak, and only the power of the strong can maintain the right of the weak. If we as a nation indeed mean what we have always said, that we are the champions of human rights, now is the time when we shall be brought to the test, the acid test, as to whether we mean what we said or not. I am not saying that because I have the least doubt as to the verdict. I am just as sure of it as if it had been rendered already. I know this great people among whom I was born and bred and whom I have had the signal honor to serve, whose mouthpiece it has been my privilege to be on both sides of the water, and I know that I am speaking their con-

science, when I speak in the name of my own conscience, that that is the duty of America and that it will be assumed and performed.

"You have been led to believe that the covenant of the league of nations is in some sense a private invention. It is not always said of whom, and I need not mention who is suspected. It is supposed that out of some sort of personal ambition or party intention an authorship, an origination is sought. My fellow countrymen, I wish that I could claim the great distinction of having invented this great idea, but it is a great idea which has been growing in the minds of all generous men for several generations. Several generations? Why, it has been the dream of the friends of humanity through all the ages, and now for the first time a great body of practical statesmen, immersed in the business of individual nations, gets together and realizes the dream of honest men. I wish that I could claim some origination part in so great an enterprise, but I can not. I was the spokesman in this matter, so far as I was influential at all, of all sorts and kinds of Americans and of all parties and factions in America. I would be ashamed, my fellow countrymen, if I treated a matter of this sort with a single thought of so small a matter as the national elections of 1920. If anybody discusses this question on the basis of party advantage, I repudiate him as a fellow American. And in order to validate what I have said, I want to make one or two quotations from representatives of a party to which I do not belong. The first I shall make from a man who has for a long time been a member of the United States Senate. In May, 1916, just about two years after the Great War began, this Senator, at a banquet at which I was myself present, uttered the following sentences:

"I know, and no one I think can know better than one who has served long in the Senate, which is charged with an important share of the ratification and confirmation of all treaties, no one can, I think, feel more deeply than I do the difficulties which confront us in the work which this league—that is the great association extending throughout the country known as the League to Enforce Peace—undertakes, but the difficulties can not be overcome unless we try to overcome them. I believe much can be done. Probably it will be impossible to stop all wars, but it certainly will be possible to stop some wars, and thus diminish their number. The way in which this problem is to be worked out must be left to this league and to those who are giving this great subject the study which it deserves. I know the obstacles. I know how quickly we shall be met with the statement that this is a dangerous question which you are putting into your agreement, that no nation can submit to the judgment of other nations, and we must be careful at the beginning not to attempt too much. I know the difficulties which arise when we speak of anything which seems to involve an alliance, but I do not believe that when Washington warned us against entangling alliances he meant for one moment that we should not join with the other civilized nations of the world if a method could be found to diminish war and encourage peace."

"It was a year ago," he continues, "in delivering the chancellor's address at Union College, I made an argument on this theory, that if we were to promote international peace at the close of the present terrible war, if we were to restore international law as it must be restored, we must find some way in which the united forces of the nations could be put behind the cause of peace and law. I said then that my hearers might think that I was picturing a Utopia, but it is in the search for Utopias that great discoveries have been made. Not failure, but low aim, is the crime. This league certainly has the highest of all aims for the benefit of humanity, and because the pathway is sown with difficulties is no reason that we should turn from it."

"The quotation is from the Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE. I read another quotation from one of the most energetic, practical, and distinguished leaders of the Republican Party, uttered in an article published in the New York Times in October, 1914:

"The one permanent move for obtaining peace which has yet been suggested with any reasonable chance of obtaining its object is by an agreement among the great powers, in which each should pledge itself not only to abide by the decisions of a common tribunal, but to back with force the decision of that common tribunal. The great civilized nations of the world which do possess force, actual or immediately potential, should combine by solemn agreement in a great world league for the peace of righteousness. A very worthy utterance by Theodore Roosevelt. I am glad to align myself with such utterances as those. I subscribe to every word of them. And here in concrete form is the fulfillment of the plan which they advocate. We can not in reason, we can not as lovers of liberty, we can not as supporters of right, turn away from it.

"What are those who advise us to turn away from it afraid of? In the first place, they are afraid that it impairs in some way



that long traditional policy of the United States which was embodied in the Monroe doctrine, but how they can fear that I can not conceive, for the document expressly says in words which I am now quoting that nothing in this covenant shall be held to affect the validity of the Monroe doctrine. The phrase was inserted under my own eye, at the suggestion—not of the phrase but the principle—of the Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses of Congress. I think I am justified in dismissing all fear that the Monroe doctrine is in the least impaired. And what is the Monroe doctrine? It is that no outside power shall attempt to impose its will in any form upon the Western Hemisphere, and that if it does the United States, acting upon its own initiative and alone, if it chooses, can resist and will resist the attempt. Could anything leave the United States freer as a champion of the independence of the Western Hemisphere than this world acknowledgment of the validity and potency of the Monroe doctrine?

"They are afraid that the league will in some way deal with our domestic affairs. The covenant expressly says that it will have no right to deal with the domestic affairs of any member of the league, and I can not imagine anything more definite or satisfactory than that. There is no ambiguity about any part of this covenant, for the matter of that, but there is certainly no ambiguity about the statement concerning domestic affairs, for it is provided that if any matter brought before the council is found to be a matter which, under international law, lies within the exclusive jurisdiction of the State making the claim, the council shall dismiss consideration of it and shall not even make a report about it. And the subjects which are giving these gentlemen the most concern are agreed by all students of international law to be domestic questions; for example, immigration, naturalization, the tariff—these are the subjects most frequently spoken of. No one of these can be dealt with by the league of nations, so far as the sovereignty of the United States is concerned. We have a perfectly clear field there, as we have in regard to the Monroe doctrine.

"It is feared that our delegates will be outvoted, because I am constantly hearing it said that the British Empire has six votes and we have one. I am perfectly content to have only one when the one counts six, and that is exactly the arrangement under the league. Let us examine that matter a little more particularly. Besides the vote of Great Britain herself, the other five votes are the votes of Canada, of South Africa, of Australia, of New Zealand, and of India. We ourselves were champions and advocates of giving a vote to Panama, of giving a vote to Cuba—both of them under the direction and protectorate of the United States—and if a vote was given to Panama and to Cuba, could it reasonably be denied to the great Dominion of Canada? Could it be denied to that stout Republic in South Africa, that is now living under a nation which did, indeed, overcome it at one time, but which did not dare retain its government in its hands, but turned it over to the very men whom it had fought? Could we deny it to Australia, that independent little republic in the Pacific, which has led the world in so many liberal reforms? Could it be denied New Zealand? Could we deny it to the hundreds of millions who live in India? But, having given these six votes, what are the facts? For you have been misled with regard to them. The league can take no active steps without the unanimous vote of all the nations represented on the council, added to a vote of the majority in the assembly itself. These six votes are in the assembly, not in the council. The assembly is not a voting body, except upon a limited number of questions, and whenever those questions are questions of action, the affirmative vote of every nation represented on the council is indispensable, and the United States is represented on the council. The six votes that you hear about can do nothing in the way of action without the consent of the United States. There are two matters in which the assembly can act, but I do not think we will be jealous of those. A majority of the assembly can admit new members into the league. A majority of the assembly can advise a member of the league to reconsider any treaty which in the opinion of the assembly of the league is apt to conflict with the operation of the league itself, but that is advice which can be disregarded, which has no validity of action in it, which has no compulsion of law in it. With the single exception of admitting new members to the league, there is no energy in the six votes which is not offset by the energy in the one vote of the United States, and I am more satisfied to be one and count six than to be six and count only six. This thing that has been talked about is a delusion. The United States is not easily frightened, and I daresay it is least easily frightened by things that are not true.

"It is also feared that causes in which we are interested will be defeated. Well, the United States is interested in a

great many causes, for the very interesting and compelling reason that the United States is made up out of all the civilized peoples of the world. There is not a national cause, my fellow citizens, which has not quickened the heartbeat of men in America. There is not a national cause which men in America do not understand, because they come of the same blood, they come of the same traditions, they recollect through long tradition the wrongs of their peoples, the hopes of their peoples, the passions of their peoples, and everywhere in America there are kinsmen to stand up and speak words of sympathy for great causes. For the first time in the history of the world, the league of nations presents a forum, a world forum, where any one of these ambitions or aspirations can be brought to the consideration of mankind. Never before has this been possible. Never before has there been a jury of mankind to which nations could take their causes, whether they were weak or strong. You have heard a great deal about article 10 of the covenant. Very well, after you have read it suppose you read article 11. Article 11 provides that it shall be the friendly right of any member of the league, big or little, strong or weak, to call attention to anything, anywhere, which is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. When anybody of kin to us in America is done wrong by any foreign government, it is likely to disturb the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends, and thus any one of the causes represented in the hearts of the American people can be brought to the attention of the whole world. One of the most effective means of winning a good cause is to bring it before that great jury. A bad cause will fare ill, but a good cause is bound to be triumphant in such a forum. Until this, international law made it an unfriendly act for any nation to call attention to any matter which did not immediately affect its own fortunes and its own right. I am amazed that so many men do not see the extraordinary change which this will bring in the transaction of human affairs. I am amazed that they do not see that now, for the first time, not selfish national policy but the general judgment of the world as to right is going to determine the fortunes of peoples, whether they be weak or whether they be strong, and I myself glory in the provisions of article 11 more than I glory in any other part of the covenant, for it draws all men together in a single friendly court, where they may discuss their own affairs and determine the issues of justice—just exactly what was desired in the hearts of the men from whom I have read extracts of opinion.

"But what disturbs me, perhaps the only thing that disturbs me, my fellow countrymen, about the form which the opposition to the league is taking is this: Certain reservations, as they are called, are proposed which in effect—I am not now stopping to form an opinion as to whether that is the intention or not; I have no right to judge the intention of a man who has not stated what his intention is—which in effect amount to this, that the United States is unwilling to assume the same obligations under the covenant of the league that are assumed by the other members of the league; that the United States wants to disclaim any part in the responsibility which the other members of the league are assuming. I want to say with all the emphasis of which I am capable that that is unworthy of the honor of the United States. The principle of justice, the principle of right, the principle of international amity is this, that there is not only an imaginary but a real equality of standing and right among all the sovereign peoples of the world. I do not care to defend the rights of a people if I must regard them as my inferiors, if I must do so with condescension, if I must do so because I am strong and they are weak. You know the men, and the women, too, I dare say, who are respectful only to those whom they regard as their social equals or their industrial equals and of whom they are more or less afraid, who will not exercise the same amenities and the same consideration for those whom they deem beneath them. Such people do not belong in democratic society, for one thing, and, for another, their whole point of view is perverted; they are incapable of justice, because the foundation of justice is that the weakest has the same rights as the strongest. I must admit, my fellow citizens, and you can not deny—and I admit it with a certain profound regret not only but with a touch of shame—that while that is the theory of democratic institutions it is not always the practice. The weak do not always fare as well as the strong, the poor do not always get the same advantage of justice that the rich get; but that is due to the passions and imperfections of human nature. The foundation of the law, the glory of the law, is that the weakest is equal to the strongest in matters of right and privilege, and the goal to which we are constantly though stumblingly and with mistakes striving to go



forward is the goal of actual equality, of actual justice, upon the basis of equality of rights, and unless you are going to establish the society of nations upon the actual foundation of equality, unless the United States is going to assume the same responsibility and just as much responsibility as the other nations of the world, we ought not to commit the mockery of going into the arrangement at all.

"I will not join in claiming under the name of justice an unjust position of privilege for the country I love and honor. Neither am I afraid of responsibility. Neither will I scuttle. Neither will I be a little American. America, in her make-up, in her purposes, in her principles, is the biggest thing in the world, and she must measure up to the measure of the world. I will be no party in belittling her. I will be no party in saying that America is afraid of responsibilities which I know she can carry and in which in carrying I am sure she shall lead the world. Why, if we were to decline to go into this humane arrangement we would be declining the invitation which all the world extends to us to lead them in the enterprise of liberty and of justice. I, for one, will not decline that invitation. I, for one, believe more profoundly than in anything else human in the destiny of the United States. I believe that she has a spiritual energy in her which no other nation can contribute to the liberation of mankind, and I know that the heart of America is stronger than her business calculations. That is what the world found out when we went into the war. When we went into the war there was not a nation in the world that did not believe we were more interested in making money out of it than in serving the cause of liberty. And when we went in, in those few months the whole world stood at amaze and ended with an enthusiastic conversion. They now believe that America will stand by anybody that is fighting for justice and for right, and we shall not disappoint them.

"The age is opening, my fellow citizens, upon a new scene. We are substituting in this covenant—and this is the main purpose of it—arbitration and discussion for war. Senator Lodge says if we can stop some wars it is worth while. If you want insurance against war, I take it you would rather have 10 per cent insurance than none; I take it that you would be delighted with 50 per cent insurance; and here I verily believe is 99 per cent insurance against war. Here are all the great fighting nations of the world, with the exception of Germany—because for the time being Germany is not a great fighting nation—solemnly covenant with one another that they will never go to war without first having either submitted the matter in dispute to arbitration and bound themselves to abide by the verdict, or, having submitted it to discussion by the council of the league of nations, in which case they will lay all the facts and documents by publication before the world, wait six months for the opinion of the council, and if they are dissatisfied with that opinion—for they are not bound by it—they will wait another three months before they go to war. There is a period of nine months of the process which is absolutely destructive of unrighteous causes—exposure to public opinion. When I find a man who in a public matter will not state his side of the case, and state it fully, I know that his side of the case is the losing side, that he dare not state it.

"At the heart of most of our industrial difficulties, my fellow citizens, and most of you are witness to this, lies the unwillingness of men to get together and talk it over. Half of the temper which now exists between those who perform labor and those who direct labor is due to the fact that those who direct labor will not talk differences over with the men whom they employ, and I am in every such instance convinced that they are wrong and dare not talk it over. Not only that, but every time the two sides do get together and talk it over they come out of the conference in a different temper from that with which they went in. There is nothing that softens the attitude of men like really, frankly laying their minds alongside of each other and their characters alongside of each other and making a fair and manly and open comparison. That is what all the great fighting nations of the world agree to with every matter of difference between them. They put it either before a jury by whom they are bound or before a jury which will publish all the facts to mankind and express a frank opinion regarding it.

"You have here what the world must have, what America went into this war to obtain. You have here an estoppel of the brutal, sudden impulse of war. You have here a restraint upon the passions of ambitious nations. You have here a safeguard of the liberty of weak nations, and the world is at last ready to stand up and in calm counsel discuss the fortunes of men and women and children everywhere. Why, my fellow citizens, nothing brings a lump into my throat quicker on this journey I am taking than to see the thronging children that

are everywhere the first, just out of childish curiosity and glee no doubt, to crowd up to the train when it stops, because I know that if by any chance we should not win this great fight for the league of nations it would be their death warrant. They belong to the generation which would then have to fight the final war, and in that final war there would not be merely seven and a half million men slain. The very existence of civilization would be in the balance, and I for one dare not face the responsibility of defeating the very purpose for which we sent our gallant men overseas. Every mother knows that her pride in the son that she lost is due to the fact, not that he helped to beat Germany, but that he helped to save the world. It was that light the other people saw in the eyes of the boys that went over there, that light as of men who see a distant horizon, that light as of men who have caught the gleam and inspiration of a great cause, and the armies of the United States seemed to those people on the other side of the sea like bodies of crusaders come out of a free nation to give freedom to their fellows, ready to sacrifice their lives for an idea, for an ideal, for the only thing that is worth living for, the spiritual purpose of redemption that rests in the hearts of mankind."

#### PROMOTION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. HARRIS. I call up Senate resolution 203 submitted by me yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays the resolution before the Senate. It will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Department of Commerce and certain other governmental agencies in various departments and independent establishments, including the Consular Service and office of the Foreign Trade Adviser of the State Department, the War Finance Corporation, the Federal Reserve Board, and International High Commission in the Treasury Department, the Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the United States Railroad Administration, the United States Shipping Board, and, perhaps, other agencies in other departments or establishments of the Government are, in the exercise of their lawful functions, engaged with matters having to do, either directly or indirectly, with the foreign commerce of the United States, but oftentimes work independently of each other and each without a knowledge of what any of the others may be doing in this direction; and

Whereas, in order to foster, promote, and develop the foreign commerce of the United States in the most effective manner, so as to meet successfully the competition of foreign agencies, it is essential that there should be no unnecessary work or duplication of work on the part of the aforesaid agencies of the Government, and that coordination and cooperation so essential to the successful promotion of the foreign commerce of the United States; and

Whereas it is desired by the Senate to consider the expediency of enacting legislation to provide for such coordination and cooperation of agencies: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the heads of the several departments and establishments hereinbefore referred to be, and they hereby are, requested to submit to the Senate as promptly as possible detailed statements covering the character, amount, and estimated cost to the Government of such work as is now being carried on under their respective jurisdictions which, directly or indirectly, has any relation to the foreign commerce of the United States or which may in any way be of value in connection with the promotion and development of such foreign commerce, which statements should also indicate the number of employees engaged on such work, and also to submit with such statements such suggestions and recommendations as they may be able to make looking to the closer cooperation and coordination of the various agencies of the Government for effective promotion of the foreign commerce of the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, there is nothing more important to our country than its foreign commerce. Our factories, our commercial industries, our farmers, and our laborers are all interested in it. We have about a dozen different governmental agencies connected with foreign commerce, among which there is no coordination whatever, but there is a great overlapping of their work. This resolution simply directs the different departments and other governmental agencies to send information so we may know what they are accomplishing.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have no doubt that there is a duplication of work in perhaps the greater number of the departments mentioned in the resolution touching our foreign commerce, but I know from past experience we will get very little information from these departments as to what they are doing in foreign commerce by way of duplication of work.

I will state to the Senator from Georgia that I have under way now an investigation of the duplication of the work of all kinds in all of the departments and independent establishments of the Government. I am not content to take the statement of the head of a department or bureau as to what activities they are carrying on in connection with any line of work. I have learned from their requests for appropriations that all deny that they are doing duplicate work in any way, shape, or form, and they believe that their particular work is the most important of all work done by the Government.

I have now under way an investigation of all the answers made by the different employees, consisting of 104,000, as to



what they are doing and for what work they are being paid by the Government. When the information is tabulated and the employees of each of the departments of the Government give their story of what their work is and along what line, I mean to compare it with what the departments themselves say they are doing, not only as to their activities in connection with our foreign commerce but as to all other kinds of labor. If I can get that work completed, in a short time I expect to address the Senate on the high cost of government; and I think, if I am not greatly mistaken, I can show to the Senate of the United States that this resolution covers merely a very small part of what ought to be ascertained by Congress in order that it may know how properly to appropriate money for the future.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator how this investigation is being conducted?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I am trying to make it with the assistants which I have now, and to make it most thoroughly, by taking the statements from the reports of the departments themselves as to what they are doing along the lines of their work and also the answers from all of the employees of the Government.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is making the investigation himself and the questions and answers are being tabulated by him rather than through a commission?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no commission which has the work in charge, so far as I am concerned, I will say to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah whether he has at hand the figures showing the enormous disparity between the cost of administering the War Risk Insurance Bureau as compared with what it would be likely to cost if the work were handed over to the Pension Bureau?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not those figures.

Mr. PENROSE. I was astounded yesterday when I was informed that the disparity involved many millions of dollars and many thousand employees.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no doubt that is the case. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that when the war ceased we thought that the number of governmental employees in the District of Columbia would be greatly and quickly reduced; no one thought otherwise than that one-half of the employees in the District of Columbia would be dispensed with; but for the month of July last was there any decrease in the number of employees in the District of Columbia? No; on the contrary, there was an increase of 1,119 employees. It is true that during the month of August there was a decrease of 258.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah—for I am very much interested in this question and I intend to submit some figures to the Senate in a few days in connection with the War Risk Bureau—why does not the Committee on Appropriations stop this wasteful expenditure for useless employees?

Mr. SMOOT. The appropriations have already been made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; but I am quite sure the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], is going to look into the appropriations more closely for the next fiscal year than they have ever been looked into heretofore, because I have heard him so state; and I promise the Senate that I am going to do the same thing. It seems to me that an investigation ought to be made not only as to our foreign commerce, but that the investigation should extend to every department and activity of the Government.

Mr. PENROSE. I hope the Senator will permit me to suggest that I trust he will also investigate a similar matter, but one of great importance, and that is the magnitude of useless printing the Government is doing of bulletins and reports that are never read by anybody.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that since the enactment of a provision in a bill which was passed by Congress in the closing hours of the last session, the Joint Committee on Printing have stopped the printing of I do not know how many Government publications; but when we began to investigate the question, and when we collected all such publications together, we hardly had space in the committee room of the Joint Committee on Printing to take care of them.

Mr. PENROSE. I want to say—and then I am done—that there is hardly a week goes by that I do not have at least a dozen Government publications sent me by constituents in Penn-

sylvania asking me why such absurd publications are sent to their offices and houses.

Mr. SMOOT. The experience of the Senator from Pennsylvania is only the experience of every Member of Congress.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely wish to state that on yesterday morning two employees from The Adjutant General's office came to my office. It seems, from their statement, that the Secretary of War has issued an order requiring the clerks there to work half an hour overtime, the ostensible reason given being that the necessities of The Adjutant General's office and the different bureaus require the clerks to give this extra time. Those clerks told me very positively that they did not do more than an hour or at the outside more than two hours of real, genuine work a day, and that frequently their chiefs would come around and tell them to make a showing of being busy. They further stated that they were satisfied that this order requiring extra time, and so forth, has really been issued for the purpose of impressing Congress with the necessity of extra appropriations. I have not any doubt that these persons were telling the truth; and it discloses a condition of things that we ought to try to get at if we can possibly do so.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Washington knows, for he is a member of the Appropriations Committee—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia rose.

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment. The Senator from Washington is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and he knows that no matter how much money Congress appropriates for any department of this Government—perhaps with a single, solitary exception—all of it is spent, and the heads of the departments will see that it is spent. If they can not spend it legitimately, they will employ people enough to require the expenditure of every dollar of the appropriation. One reason for that is that they think if they should happen to turn any unexpended balance back into the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year the Congress of the United States would take that as an indication that the money they had asked for was unnecessary. The departments of our Government have now gotten into a position where they not only ask for the amounts they know they have to have, but they ask for all they think they can get, with the idea that Congress is going to cut some of it out anyhow, and they will be on the safe side. That practice must be stopped.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if he thinks the resolution will occupy any considerable time? If so, I intend to ask the junior Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Utah to consent that it go over until to-morrow without prejudice.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to its going over without prejudice if the Senator from Georgia desires, and whatever I have to say further on it I will say to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. It is quite agreeable to me to let the resolution go over.

Mr. SMOOT. It is quite agreeable to me also, because I know the senior Senator from Georgia desires to have the bank bill considered, and I have no inclination whatever to interfere with the consideration of that measure.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire just a moment in which to say that I have been much interested in the subject that has just been under discussion, and in what has been said in regard to the Committee on Appropriations. There is a great deal of truth in the statements made. I have noted with pleasure the announcements in the newspapers that The Adjutant General of the Army has called upon his employees to add a half hour to the scant number of hours during which such employees are usually on duty. If department and bureau heads would insist that the work in their charge must be kept up to date and that their employees would have to work overtime until their work is caught up, I believe such action would in a measure overcome this soldiering on duty, with a large proportion of the employees doing as little as possible for fear of a reduction of force, or in an endeavor to make the work in hand last as long as possible.

The Committee on Appropriations is surrounded by a great many uncertainties and difficulties. During the war we were, of course, all anxious to win; we asked but few questions, and acted quickly in appropriating all the money thought necessary for war purposes, no matter how fabulous the sums might be. As a consequence, there has been built up, or at least enlarged, a system of appropriating lump sums for various kinds of employment. Of course, there are many old and faithful employees who perform their duties with interest in the affairs of



their department and with lively interest, also, in the affairs of the Nation at large. But because of the greatly increased work in the departments during the war, the departments have taken on, from the byways, highways, and hedges, great numbers of boys and girls unused to such service, unused to real labor along any line, and, more particularly, unused to office responsibility and work such as required in these Government departments. And among such employees in particular, and among some of the older employees as well—although I will not say employees of the Government generally—I must acknowledge, as stated by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones], and as observed by me personally, very little is accomplished for the good of the Government in what they term the day's work. I believe that many of the clerks in the large departments are not doing more than from a quarter to a half of the work they are supposed to do, which they ought to do, and which we have a right to expect them to do.

With the war over, the cleaning-up time is at hand, and it is a tedious matter to unravel all of the changes to which the ordinary line of good conduct has been subjected.

It is true that some of the departments take a generous line of employees in order to get war matters closed up and affairs put back into the natural level.

Congress and the people of the country expect, of course, that the majority of the thousands and tens of thousands of extra clerks will go back to their homes or into other lines of employment. But against this is the fear on the part of the departments that their employees may become too few, and the hope on the part of many of the employees that by droning along and doing as little as possible they may prolong their own tenure of office along with that of their many associates, apparently without thought or care regarding the immense cost to the Government—to the taxpayers. Indeed, it oftentimes seems as though many of the employees, and, I regret to say, their chiefs as well, whose desire seems to be to hold their employees as long as possible in fear that it may be said, in case of reductions of force, that the work and importance of their bureaus are retrograding, are leagued together in the thought that the Government is made of money; that if it runs short it has only to order more money printed at the bureau, and that economy in governmental affairs is by no means necessary but, on the other hand, out of date and old-fashioned.

It has been our hope, as members of the Appropriations Committee, that the joint commission investigating the salaries of Government employees would be able at an early date to furnish us with the information we need for the purpose of establishing proper salary bases for Government employees. We hope that we may learn through the questionnaires which, I understand, have been sent out to both employers and employees—that is to say, to heads and chiefs of divisions and to each and every employee—how many employees, and of what grade, are in each bureau of each department, and what recommendations may be made as to reasonable salaries for each class. After we receive such knowledge, we may then provide for more stated, statutory places—unless lump-sum and emergency employees are to be continued, with the incident hullabaloo and tangle in which we find ourselves when we attempt to determine what employees are really needed in each department and what the line of wages and salaries should be.

It is the desire of the Appropriations Committee to furnish every department with sufficient employees to do its work, and to pay sufficient wages or salaries for the classes of work assigned to them, and then to insist in return that we have less shirking and complaining on the part of the employees, and more real interest in their work. In other words, we want to pay due wages and salaries for each day's work, but we want some showing and some accomplishment registered in the day's work of every employee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in that connection, if I may have just a moment of time, I desire to say there is a new system growing up in the departments which I should like to see stopped at once. Hardly a new clerk is appointed who receives a salary over \$2,000 in any of the departments who does not request that he be given a messenger. If you go to the departments you will see herds of messengers in the hallways. Instead of having a central head for the messenger service in each of the departments, clerks now must have a special messenger. I simply throw this suggestion out now, because I understand that the Navy Department have under investigation at the present time a plan of bringing under one head the messenger service of that department so that whenever a messenger is wanted the one calling for the messenger will know just where to call for him. If that plan is carried out I expect to see the number of messengers in the Navy Department reduced two-thirds at least. That policy ought to be carried out in every department of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the resolution went over, I understood.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There has been no request made of the Chair that the resolution shall go over.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understood that there was a request that it go over without prejudice until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There may have been some discussion on the floor of the Senate to that effect, but there has been no such request made of the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The junior Senator from Georgia stated that such action would be agreeable to him. I request that it go over.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks that the resolution go over until to-morrow. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will go over.

#### CONTROL OF FOOD PRODUCTS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. McLEAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration—

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator permit me to submit a conference report?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to House bill 8624, the so-called food-control bill, embodying also the bill regulating rentals in the District of Columbia. I had intended to ask for the consideration of the conference report at this time, but as it is a measure of very great importance, especially to the people of the District of Columbia, I ask that it lie on the table and be printed in the Record.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the matter is of such very great importance that I should like to have the conference report read now, so that Senators may be informed as to what the provisions of the report are. I make this request because I have understood through the public prints that the provisions of the so-called rent bill have been substantially revised and rewritten.

Mr. GRONNA. That is true.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from North Dakota about how long it will take to read the conference report?

Mr. GRONNA. It will not take very long, I will say to the Senator; it is a very short report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will lie on the table for the present.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8624) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel,' approved August 10, 1917," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Section 1"; and, on page 1, after line 2, of the engrossed bill, insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as 'the food control and the District of Columbia rents act.'"

#### "TITLE I. FOOD-CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

#### "TITLE II. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENTS."

"SEC. 101. When used in this title, unless the context indicates otherwise—

"The term 'rental property' means any land or building or part thereof in the District of Columbia rented or hired and the service agreed or required by law or by determination of the commission to be furnished in connection therewith; but does not include a hotel or apartment.



"The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, association, or corporation.

"The term 'hotel' or 'apartment' means any hotel or apartment or part thereof, in the District of Columbia, rented or hired and the land and outbuildings appurtenant thereto, and the service agreed or required by law or by determination of the commission to be furnished in connection therewith.

"The term 'owner' includes a lessor or sublessor, or other person entitled to receive rent or charges for the use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel or apartment, or any interest therein, or his agent.

"The term 'tenant' includes a subtenant, lessee, sublessee, or other person, not the owner, entitled to the use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel, or apartment.

"The term 'service' includes the furnishing of light, heat, water, telephone or elevator service, furniture, furnishings, window shades, screens, awnings, storage, kitchen, bath and laundry facilities and privileges, maid service, janitor service, removal of refuse, making all repairs suited to the type of building or necessitated by ordinary wear and tear, and any other privilege or service connected with the use or occupancy of any rental property, apartment, or hotel.

"The term 'commission' means the rent commission of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 102. A commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the rent commission of the District of Columbia, which shall be composed of three commissioners, none of whom shall be, directly or indirectly, engaged in, or in any manner interested in or connected with, the real estate or renting business in the District of Columbia. The commissioners shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The term of each commissioner shall be three years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the commissioner whom he succeeds. The commission shall at the time of its organization and annually thereafter elect a chairman from its own membership. The commission may make such regulations as may be necessary to carry this title into effect.

"All powers and duties of the commission may be exercised by a majority of its members. A vacancy in the commission shall not impair the right of the remaining commissioners to exercise all the powers of the commission. The commission shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"SEC. 103. Each commissioner shall receive a salary of \$5,000 a year, payable monthly. The commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive a salary of \$3,000 a year, payable in like manner; and, subject to the provisions of the civil-service laws, it may appoint and remove such officers, employees, and agents and make such expenditures for rent, printing, telegrams, telephone, law books, books of reference, periodicals, furniture, stationery, office equipment, and other supplies and expenses as may be necessary to the administration of this title. All of the expenditures of the commission shall upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman of the commission, be audited and paid in the same manner as other expenditures for the District of Columbia.

"With the exception of the secretary, all employees of the commission shall be appointed from lists of eligibles supplied by the Civil Service Commission and in accordance with the civil-service law.

"SEC. 104. The assessor of the District of Columbia shall serve ex officio as an advisory assistant to the commission, but he shall have none of the powers or duties of a commissioner. He shall attend the meetings and hearings of the commission. Every officer or employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia, whenever requested by the commission, shall supply to the commission any data or information pertaining to the administration of this title which may be contained in the records of his office. The assessor shall receive for the performance of the duties required by this section a salary of \$1,000 per annum, payable monthly, in addition to such other salary as may be prescribed for his office by law.

"SEC. 105. For the purposes of this title the commission or any officer, employee, or agent duly authorized in writing by it, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy, any books, accounts, records, papers, or correspondence relating to any matter which the commission is authorized to consider or investigate; and the commission shall have power to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all such books, accounts, records, papers, and correspondence relating to any such matter. Any member of the commission may sign subpoenas, administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

"Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such books, accounts, records, papers, and correspondence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. In case of disobedience to a subpoena or of the contumacy of any witness appearing before the commission, the commission may invoke the aid of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia or of any district court of the United States. Such court may thereupon issue an order requiring the person subpoenaed to obey the subpoena, or to give evidence touching the matter in question. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. No officer or employee of the commission shall, unless authorized by the commission or by a court of competent jurisdiction, make public any information obtained by the commission.

"SEC. 106. For the purpose of this title it is declared that all (a) rental property and (b) apartments and hotels are affected with a public interest, and that all rents and charges therefor, all service in connection therewith, and all other terms and conditions of the use or occupancy thereof, shall be fair and reasonable; and any unreasonable or unfair provision of a lease or other contract for the use or occupancy of such rental property, apartment, or hotel with respect to such rents, charges, service, terms, or conditions is hereby declared to be contrary to public policy. The commission upon its own initiative may, or upon complaint shall, determine whether the rent, charges, service, and other terms or conditions of a lease or other contract for the use or occupancy of any such rental property, hotel, or apartment are fair and reasonable. Such complaints may be made (a) by or on behalf of any tenant, and (b) by any owner except where the tenant is in possession under a lease or other contract the term specified in which has not expired, and the fairness and reasonableness of which has not been determined by the commission.

"In all such cases the commission shall give notice personally or by registered mail and afford an opportunity to be heard to all parties in interest. The commission shall promptly hear and determine the issues involved in all complaints submitted to it. All hearings before the commission shall be open to the public. If the commission determines that such rents, charges, service, or other terms or conditions are unfair or unreasonable, it shall determine and fix such fair and reasonable rent or charges therefor, and / or fair and reasonable service, terms, and conditions of use or occupancy. In any suit in any court of the United States or of the District of Columbia involving any question arising out of the relation of landlord and tenant with respect to any rental property, apartment, or hotel, except on appeal from the commission's determination as provided in this title, such court shall determine the rights and duties of the parties in accordance with the determination and regulations of the commission relevant thereto.

"SEC. 107. A determination of the commission fixing a fair and reasonable rent or charge made in a proceeding begun by complaint shall be effective from the date of the filing of the complaint. The difference between the amount of rent and charges paid for the period from the filing of the complaint to the date of the commission's determination and the amount that would have been payable for such period at the fair and reasonable rate fixed by the commission may be added to or subtracted from, as the case demands, future rent payments, or after the final decision of an appeal from the commission's determination may be sued for and recovered in an action in the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 108. Unless within 10 days after the filing of the commission's determination any party to the complaint appeals therefrom to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, the determination of the commission shall be final and conclusive. If such an appeal is taken from the determination of the commission, the record before the commission, or such part thereof as the court may order, shall be certified by it to the court and shall constitute the record before the court, and the commission's determination shall not be modified or set aside by the court except for error of law. If any party applies to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shows to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the commission, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the commission and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the court may deem proper. The commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, for



the modification or setting aside of its original determination, with the return of such additional evidence. In the proceedings before such court on appeal from a determination of the commission, the commission shall appear by its counsel or other representative and submit oral or written arguments to support the findings and the determination of the commission.

"SEC. 109. The right of a tenant to the use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel, or apartment, existing at the time this act takes effect, or thereafter acquired, under any lease or other contract for such use or occupancy or under any extension thereof by operation of law, shall, notwithstanding the expiration of the term fixed by such lease or contract, continue at the option of the tenant, subject, however, to any determination or regulation of the commission relevant thereto; and such tenant shall not be evicted or dispossessed so long as he pays the rent and performs the other terms and conditions of the tenancy as fixed by such lease or contract, or in case such lease or contract is modified by any determination or regulation of the commission, then as fixed by such modified lease or contract. All remedies of the owner at law or equity, based on any provision of any such lease or contract to the effect that such lease or contract shall be determined or forfeited if the premises are sold, are hereby suspended so long as this title is in force. Every purchaser shall take conveyance of any rental property, hotel, or apartment subject to the rights of tenants as provided in this title. The rights of the tenants under this title shall be subject to the limitation that the bona fide owner of any rental property, apartment, or hotel shall have the right to possession thereof for actual and bona fide occupancy by himself, or his wife, children, or dependents, upon giving 30 days' notice in writing, served in the manner provided by section 1223 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia,' approved May 3, 1901, as amended, which notice shall contain a full and correct statement of the facts and circumstances upon which the same is based; but in no case shall possession be demanded or obtained by such owner in contravention of the terms of any such lease or contract. If there is a dispute between the owner and the tenant as to the accuracy or sufficiency of the statement set forth in such notice as to the good faith of such demand or as to the service of notice, the matters in dispute shall be determined by the commission upon complaint as provided in section 106 of this title.

"SEC. 110. Pending the final decision on appeal from a determination of the commission the commission's determination shall be in full force and effect, and the appeal shall not operate as a supersedeas or in any manner stay or postpone the enforcement of the determination appealed from. Immediately upon the entry of a final decision on the appeal the commission shall, if necessary, modify its determination in order to make it conform to such decision. The difference, if any, between the amount of rent and charges paid for the period from the date of the filing by the commission of the determination appealed from and the amount that would have been payable for such period under the determination as modified in accordance with the final decision on appeal may be added to or allowed on account of, as the case demands, future rent payments or may be sued for and recovered in an action in the municipal court in the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 111. The determination of the commission in a proceeding begun by complaint or upon its own initiative fixing fair and reasonable rents, charges, service, and other terms and conditions of use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel, or apartment shall constitute the commission's determination of the fairness and reasonableness of such rents, charges, service, terms, or conditions for the rental property, hotel, or apartment affected, and shall remain in full force and effect notwithstanding any change in ownership or tenancy thereof, unless and until the commission modifies or sets aside such determination upon complaint either of the owner or of the tenant.

"SEC. 112. If the owner of any rental property, apartment, or hotel collects any rent or charge therefor in excess of the amount fixed in a determination of the commission made and in full force and effect in accordance with the provisions of this title, he shall be liable for and the commission is hereby authorized and directed to commence an action in the municipal court in the District of Columbia to recover double the amount of such excess, together with the costs of the proceeding, which shall include an attorney's fee of \$50, to be taxed as part of the costs. Out of any sums received on account of such recovery the commission shall pay over to the tenant the amount of the excess so paid by him and the balance shall be paid into the treasury of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That if the commission finds that such excess was paid by the tenant voluntarily and with knowledge of the commission's determination,

the whole amount of such recovery shall be paid into the treasury of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 113. If in any proceeding before the commission, begun by complaint or on the commission's own initiative, and involving any lease or other contract for the use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel, or apartment the commission finds that at any time after the passage of this act but during the tenancy the owner has, directly or indirectly, willfully withdrawn from the tenant any service agreed or required by a determination of the commission to be furnished, or has by act, neglect, or omission contrary to such lease or contract or to the law or any ordinance or regulation made in pursuance of law, or of a determination of the commission, exposed the tenant, directly or indirectly, to any unsafe or insanitary condition or imposed upon him any burden, loss, or unusual inconvenience in connection with his use or occupancy of such rental property, hotel, or apartment, the commission shall determine the sum which in its judgment will fairly and reasonably compensate or reimburse the tenant therefor. In any such proceeding involving a lease or other contract, the term specified in which had not expired at the time the proceeding was begun, the commission shall likewise determine the amount or value of any bonus or other consideration in excess of the rental named in such lease or contract received at any time directly or indirectly by the owner in connection with such lease or contract. The tenant may recover any amount so determined by the commission in an action in the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 114. Whenever under this title a tenant is entitled to bring suit to recover any sum due him under any determination of the commission, the commission shall, upon application by the tenant and without expense to him, commence and prosecute in the municipal court of the District of Columbia an action on behalf of the tenant for the recovery of the amount due, and in such case the court shall include in any judgment rendered in favor of the tenant the costs of the action, including a reasonable attorney's fee, to be fixed by the court. Such costs and attorney's fee when recovered shall be paid into the treasury of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 115. The commission shall, by general order, from time to time prescribe the procedure to be followed in all proceedings under its jurisdiction. Such procedure shall be as simple and summary as may be practicable, and the commission and parties appearing before it shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence or of pleading.

"SEC. 116. Any person who with intent to avoid the provisions of this title enters into any agreement or arrangement for the payment of any bonus or other consideration in connection with any lease or other contract for the use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel, or apartment, or who participates in any fictitious sale or other device or arrangement the purpose of which is to grant or obtain the use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel, or apartment without subjecting such use or occupancy to the provisions of this title or to the jurisdiction of the commission shall upon conviction be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not exceeding one year or by both.

"SEC. 117. The commission shall prescribe standard forms of leases and other contracts for the use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel, or apartment and shall require their use by the owner thereof. Every such lease or contract entered into after the commission has prescribed and promulgated a form for the tenancy provided by such lease or contract shall be deemed to accord with such standard form; and any such lease or contract in any proceeding before the commission or in any court of the United States or of the District of Columbia shall be interpreted, applied, and enforced in the same manner as if it were in the form and contained the stipulations of such standard form. Upon the request of the commission the owner of an hotel or apartment shall file with the commission plans and other data in such detail as the commission requires, descriptive of the rooms, accommodations, and service in connection with such hotel or apartment, and a schedule of rates and charges therefor. The commission may, after consideration of such plans, schedules, data, or other information, determine and fix a schedule of fair and reasonable rates and charges for such hotel or apartment; and the rates and charges stated in such schedule shall thereafter constitute the fair and reasonable rates and charges for such hotel or apartment. The commission's determination in such case shall be made after such notice and hearing and shall have the same force and effect and be subject to appeal in the same manner as a determination of the commission under section 106 of this title.

"SEC. 118. No tenant shall assign his lease of or sublet any rental property or apartment at a rate in excess of the rate



paid by him under his lease without the consent of the commission upon application in a particular case, and in such case the commission shall determine a fair and reasonable rate of rent or charge for such assignment or sublease.

"SEC. 119. The public resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to prevent profiteering in the District of Columbia,' approved May 31, 1918, as amended, is hereby repealed, to take effect 60 days after the date of the confirmation by the Senate of the commissioners first nominated by the President under the provisions of this title; but a determination by the commission made within such period of 60 days shall be enforced in accordance with the provisions of this title, notwithstanding the provisions of such public resolution. All laws or parts of laws in conflict with any provision of this title are hereby suspended so long as this title is in force to the extent that they are in such conflict.

"SEC. 120. The sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated and made immediately available to carry out the provisions of this title, one-half thereof to be paid out of money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated and the other one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 121. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this title shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof, but shall be confined in its operations to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

"SEC. 122. It is hereby declared that the provisions of this title are made necessary by emergencies growing out of the war with the Imperial German Government, resulting in rental conditions in the District of Columbia dangerous to the public health and burdensome to public officers and employees whose duties require them to reside within the District and other persons whose activities are essential to the maintenance and comfort of such officers and employees, and thereby embarrassing the Federal Government in the transaction of the public business. It is also declared that this title shall be considered temporary legislation, and that it shall terminate on the expiration of three years from the date of the passage of this act, unless sooner repealed."

And the Senate agrees to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"To amend an act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel,' approved August 10, 1917, and to regulate rents in the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

A. J. GEONNA,  
G. W. NORRIS,  
HOKE SMITH,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*  
G. N. HAUGEN,  
J. C. McLAUGHLIN,  
THOMAS L. RUBEY,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

#### BILLS OF EXCHANGE.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 190, House bill 7478.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7478) to amend sections 5200 and 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by acts of June 22, 1906, and September 24, 1918.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 23, after the word "section," it is proposed to insert the following:

The total liabilities to any association of any person, corporation, firm, or company, or the several members thereof, upon the discount of bills of exchange, drafts, demand obligations, and commercial or business paper, as described in "(1)" and "(2)" hereof, shall not exceed at any time the paid-in and unimpaired capital stock and surplus of said association.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	McLean	Shields
Ball	Gronna	McNary	Simmons
Bankhead	Hale	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Harding	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Harris	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Harrison	New	Smoot
Capper	Henderson	Newberry	Spencer
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Swanson
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thomas
Curtis	Kellogg	Page	Townsend
Dial	Kendrick	Penrose	Trammell
Dillingham	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Edge	Keyes	Phipps	Wadsworth
Elkins	Kirby	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Knox	Poindestier	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	La Follette	Pomerene	Warren
France	Lenroot	Ransdell	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Robinson	Williams
Gay	McCormick	Sheppard	Wolcott
Gerry	McKellar	Sherman	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who are attending the session of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] are detained from the Senate by illness in their families. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] are detained on official business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I discussed this question on yesterday, and I do not expect to occupy the time of the Senate except to state very briefly the purpose of the amendment.

Under this bill as it now stands, by virtue of the amendment which was adopted on yesterday, a borrower, instead of getting 10 per cent of the capital and surplus on his note, can now get 25 per cent of the capital and surplus, provided it is secured by shipping documents. In other words, the Senate and the House have voted to increase the amount that this borrower can get with the aid of these documents 150 per cent. Under paragraph "(4)," and under the ruling of the Comptroller of the Currency, a borrower can get on Government bonds \$100 out of the capital, surplus, and deposits of the bank, less legal reserves, for every \$105 of Government bonds or certificates of indebtedness which he presents. This privilege is unlimited, except, of course, the bank must retain its legal reserves. Under paragraphs "(1)" and "(2)," on drafts or bills of exchange drawn against existing values, he can now secure the entire contents of the vaults of the bank, less legal reserves. The purpose of my amendment is to limit the amount that he can get under the provisions known as paragraphs "(1)" and "(2)" to an amount equal to the capital and surplus; and it seems to me that in safe banking that is as much as he ought to be permitted to get.

That is all I care to say, Mr. President.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I simply want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, if adopted, will change the law that has been in operation for many years. If it is adopted, I make the prediction that no small country bank will join the Federal Reserve System; and I had supposed that one of the main purposes of that act was to invite small country banks into the system.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], who has not voted. I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who has not voted, but I am relieved from that pair on this vote. I vote "nay."



Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]; and

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 59, as follows:

## YEAS—18.

Borah	Kenyon	Norris	Sherman
Chamberlain	La Follette	Nugent	Wadsworth
Gerry	Lenroot	Phelan	Warren
Harding	McCormick	Phipps	
Kellogg	Newberry	Pomerene	

## NAYS—59.

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Simmons
Ball	Gay	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Gore	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Gronna	McNary	Smoot
Brandagee	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Capper	Harris	Myers	Swanson
Colt	Harrison	New	Townsend
Cummins	Henderson	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Hitchcock	Penrose	Underwood
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Polindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Kendrick	Ransdell	Watson
Elkins	Keyes	Robinson	Williams
Fletcher	Kirby	Sheppard	Wolcott
France	Knox	Shields	

## NOT VOTING—19.

Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Stanley
Culberson	King	Page	Sterling
Fall	McCumber	Reed	Sutherland
Fernald	Martin	Smith, Md.	Thomas
Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Smith, S. C.	

So Mr. POMERENE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, believing that the Senate should have an opportunity to vote upon this bill, I voted to report it. I am opposed to the bill, however. It proposes to give the country banks an extension of their facilities for discounting drafts. That is one of the purposes of the bill. Practically the object is to enable the cotton producers of the South—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Jersey inadvertently used the phrase "country banks." The Senator does not mean that the bill gives any special privileges to the country banks.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No.

Mr. GRONNA. It gives the same privileges to all banks.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. To all banks, but practically the effect of it is to enlarge the facilities for loaning on drafts by the smaller banks of the country.

I have a great sympathy with the producer of cotton in the South, in the problems that he has in financing the cotton, in transporting it, carrying it to market, and making the necessary financial arrangements to ship the cotton. This bill is ostensibly for that purpose.

I understand that heretofore under the Federal reserve system a country bank having \$50,000 capital and \$10,000 surplus was enabled to recognize drafts from a country buyer to the extent of 10 per cent of its capital and surplus. Under the present provision that buyer is enabled to draw drafts against that country bank for \$12,500, thereby extending the credit to that extent. When the Federal reserve bank act was originally drawn it was deemed in the interests of conservatism that 10 per cent should be the limit. The South has probably had many difficulties in financing its cotton crop, but it has financed it, and the question before the Senate is to determine whether we want to depart from that conservative policy of the Federal reserve banking system and extend these facilities practically 150 per cent. I am opposed to it because I believe that in this time of inflation it is unwise, and with the experience I have had with regard to the financing of the southern cotton crop, I believe that it is unnecessary.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I shall vote against this bill. I believe it an unsafe measure. I do not believe that safe banking permits any institution to loan 25 per cent of its capital and surplus to one man or one business concern, even if it is secured by property having an estimated value of 115 per cent.

It is not simply a question, as the Senator from New Jersey said, of drawing drafts. It is an enlargement of the law, and permits a bank to loan 25 per cent of its capital and surplus if secured by shipping documents, warehouse receipts, or other such documents securing title to readily marketable, nonperishable staples, including livestock. That amount of business can not be safely transacted by the banks of this country to the extent of a quarter of all their assets, including their surplus.

The soundness of national banks in this country has been very well established during previous years. Very few of them have failed, because the restrictions have been well advised, and the bankers themselves have observed them. If this bill is passed the best bankers of this country will not follow its provisions, but the imprudent ones will. Good banking will not recognize such a law, and poor banking ought not to be encouraged.

This is not a time for further inflation of credits in this country. The inflation that has occurred, which is to-day imperiling the business interests of the entire world, and increasing the cost of living to the maximum, comes not alone from the inflation of the currency, but enormous inflation of credits. The very large amounts that we borrowed during the war caused inflation, and every time we touch the Federal reserve banking system we permit an increase of currency, an increase of credit, and produce a greater expansion.

Mr. McLEAN. If the bill permitted the increase of a dollar of currency in the country, I should vote against it.

Mr. KELLOGG. I did not say it did.

Mr. McLEAN. If it increased or expanded the credits of the country one dollar, I should vote against it. It does neither. The bill simply provides for a redistribution of credits already in the vaults of the banks. If a bank has reserves which will permit it to loan, we will say, \$30,000, and it can not loan more than \$7,000, it must send those reserves to some large bank and that large bank will take toll; but there is no expansion of credit to the amount of one dollar.

Mr. KELLOGG. Sending it to other banks spreads the danger of loss, and the very object of the provision in the present law is to distribute the risk among a large number of banks. I live in a country where enormous sums of money are required to move crops in a few months. The same situation exists in the South with regard to the cotton crop. We move in the Northwest not only grain crops in a few months, but stock, and yet it has been accomplished by spreading the risks over more banks. The South can manage in the same way, but if they want their banks to do all the business and loan all the money, of course they will seek an unlimited credit.

There are banks enough and credit enough in the country to handle all the crops, and I think it is an exceedingly dangerous innovation. It is only the entering wedge. If we make it 25 per cent, they will subsequently contend that 50 per cent is just as safe if it is secured. We might just as well provide that the entire capital may be loaned to one concern if the loan is secured. That is not good banking and it is not good business for the country. Of course, this does not extend the circulating medium—that is, currency—but it permits an undue expansion of the credits in particular banks, which makes it unsafe.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARDING in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. KELLOGG. It makes it unsafe in any community which has an opportunity to loan all the money. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McLEAN. It simply provides that if a bank has \$30,000 to loan, it can loan it to three persons instead of ten, if the security is good. In many of the small towns in the South there may be only one bank. Assume that it is a financially strong bank and a cotton buyer goes there and wants an accommodation of \$15,000. The bank's capital is \$50,000. Under the law as it is at present—

Mr. KELLOGG. He can not get it.

Mr. McLEAN. No; he can not get it, but what does he do? He goes to the bank across the street, if it is a State bank, which has a limit of 25 per cent and there he gets accommodation. Why should the national banks be discriminated against and why should not they be permitted, if their customer is a good one and there is only one customer, to loan to him 25 per cent if it is secured by cotton?

Mr. KELLOGG. By the same course of reasoning they ought to be permitted to loan the entire amount. The basic principle of the Federal reserve banking system is to keep the banks safe for the whole community and not for the benefit of one or two men who want to borrow the entire capital and surplus of a bank. It is a fact that national banks have maintained their soundness because they have followed the law. That is one of the reasons why it seems to me we ought not to enact the present bill.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, some fear has been expressed that the banks will lose money on cotton. If I may be excused from a personal allusion, I will state that over 20 years ago I organ-



ized and built the second bonded warehouse in South Carolina in which to store cotton. In 1900 I organized a bank, and I have been president of both of those institutions ever since. We have handled thousands and thousands of bales of cotton and have never lost a dollar on cotton yet. Not only that, but I do not recall that any bank in our country, and we handle great quantities of cotton down there, of course, has lost a dollar on a bale of cotton in the last 20 years. When cotton was bringing 6 and 7 cents a pound it did not take very much money to handle it, but now it is bringing 30 cents a pound and it takes considerably more money to handle it. The same way with bacon. A few years ago it only brought, 6, 7, and 8 cents, and now it is bringing several times this amount. We buy that from the West. It is the same way with horses and mules; we buy those from Indiana and Kentucky and ship them in. Instead of being worth \$100, as they were a few years ago, they are bringing \$300, \$400, and \$500. It is the same way with wheat and corn. So it takes a greater amount of credit to handle the commerce of the country, and that is the reason why we want this limit extended.

Mr. KELLOGG. The very fact that products are very high adds to the risk instead of taking it away.

Mr. DIAL. That, of course, takes more money, but the protection of the bank is in the good judgment of the officers of the bank. Under any law the officers of the bank do not have to loan to the limit to which they are authorized to loan. That depends upon their good judgment. Then, too, if they have the security there, that can readily be turned into cash.

This bill, as I understand it, is not so much a matter of permission to make permanent loans, or loans for long periods of time. It is more in the nature of a loan to aid products in transit.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DIAL. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. Of course, if it is true that it requires more money for the merchant to do a given amount of business, it also by that same token would require more capital and surplus for the banks to do the same amount of business. Is not that true?

Mr. DIAL. That is correct.

Mr. POMERENE. If that be true, and of course it is, then it must follow that when you double or treble the amount of money which a given borrower can get from a bank, you are by that much increasing the risk which the bank runs when it extends the accommodation.

Mr. DIAL. Of course, the bank would not want to loan a big amount to one customer, but it is merely a matter of caring for the product while it is in transit, while it is being turned into cash. It is merely to help the producer get his commodities to market.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I shall not occupy further the time of the Senate on the bill except to ask the chairman of the committee having the bill in charge one or two questions. He stated that the bill would not result in an expansion of credit. I should like to ask the Senator whether it would result in a curtailment of credit?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly it would.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator then said that the banks have these credits in their vaults.

Mr. McLEAN. If they call them in, they would have them in their vaults.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well. Then if the credits were in their vaults, and calling them in would result in a curtailment of credits, I can not see why putting them out of their vaults does not result in expansion.

Mr. McLEAN. It does not affect the total reserves upon which credits can be based. Credits will be called in to-day and loaned out to-morrow. You have simply exchanged the credits; taken them from one borrower and given them to another.

Mr. LENROOT. It is the assumption upon the part of the Senator that all the credits of the bank are utilized which the law permits them to utilize, but it is an assumption that does not rest upon any basis of fact. The fact is that wherever banks have a larger reserve than the minimum required by the law, and if the passage of the pending bill permits the extension of a larger line of credit than is now permitted, you have exactly to that extent expanded the credits of the country, and you can not get away from it.

As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] very clearly stated, the bill is not alone an expansion of credits relating to drafts and bills of exchange, but under the bill a man may borrow money upon his own property, concerning which there

has never been a sale or contract of sale, up to 25 per cent of the capital and surplus of the bank. The result of it is going to be, Mr. President, that it will permit the owners of cotton to speculate in cotton by borrowing from the bank 90 per cent of the then market value of the cotton, and if the speculation is not in the interest of the owner, the bank will be left holding the bag and suffering the loss. It ought not to be done.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to repeat what I said upon the bill when it was under consideration about a week ago. I have always felt that for the safety of business our banking business and banking institutions should be upon the most conservative plane possible. I feel that the bill as reported and now before the Senate to be voted upon is extending a power for banks to make loans that should not be granted to them.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator knows that in the State of Utah the State banks are allowed single lines of credit to the amount of 30 per cent of their capital and surplus.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator does not know any such thing.

Mr. McLEAN. That is my recollection.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is mistaken. There is a limit on the amount that can be loaned to any person or corporation to 15 per cent.

Mr. McLEAN. Will the Senator state what the limit is?

Mr. SMOOT. The percentage allowed is 15 per cent of the capital and surplus.

Mr. McLEAN. It has been changed very recently, in my opinion.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I think that is as much as any bank ought to be allowed to loan to one person or corporation. In fact, I am rather inclined to believe that the banking laws as they have existed ever since the national banking system was established, namely, limiting such loans to 10 per cent, is safe and conservative banking.

As I said, the conservative bankers of the country are not going to take advantage of this law. They are not going to change the system under which they have loaned in the past, and they are the bankers who would say that the bill is unwise. The trouble is that the bankers who will take advantage of it will be those who will rely upon receiving assistance from some other banks to carry them through in case trouble came. To what extent it will be used in the country I can not say, but I am quite sure that it will happen that the weaker banks are the very banks that will take advantage of the change. Those that are not doing a conservative banking business to-day will claim that the Congress of the United States has placed its approval upon their past policy.

I presume the bill will pass. I am not going to take any more of the time of the Senate upon it, but I wish to say that I can not quite agree with the Senator having the bill in charge that it is not going to inflate the currency of the country. Whenever there is more money wanted in any one section of the country, and whenever that money is furnished, I care not from what source—I am speaking now of the sources within the United States—it will decrease the volume of money in the section furnishing the money, which, no doubt, will be in great banking centers, and to replace it an additional issue of Federal reserve notes will be requested, and when issued there will be an inflation of the currency to that amount.

Mr. McLEAN. They are not permitted to do it under this bill. The Senator knows this bill does not affect section 13 of the Federal reserve act, which limits the right of rediscount to 10 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware of that, but what I am contending is that if there is a call for this money which it is said this bill is intended to furnish the money has got to come from some other source than the banks of the South, we will say, or from the banks of the West. The whole object of the bill is to increase the indebtedness of the individual to the banks in certain sections of country, and when the individual credit is increased the bank that has not the money to meet same must secure the money from some other section of the country. These banks will appeal to the banks with which they are doing business in New York or Chicago or St. Louis, or the other banking centers of the United States. As that credit is extended there is no question that it will produce an increase in the currency of our country.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, if my information is correct, the banks of the South have all the cash they want in order to finance the cotton crop. All they want is an opportunity to use it. In many towns there is only one buyer of cotton and only one bank, and that condition simply forces the buyer to go to some other town or to New York to get his credit.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator now that if he will examine the last bank statement as to the condition of the banks of



the South he will find that to-day very many of them are rediscounting paper. No bank ever rediscounts paper unless it requires more money to loan than it has either from its capital, surplus, or deposits. The rediscounting of paper, the Senator will find, is going on in nearly all sections of the country, and particularly during the time crops are being financed.

Mr. McLEAN. They are not rediscounting such paper under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am not saying that; but this bill proposes to grant the banks the right to loan their customers a greater amount than can be loaned under existing law. It is for that reason that I say that the proposed increase of power as to the loaning of depositors' money is, in my opinion, too great. For that reason I am going to vote against the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I will say only a word. This bill originated with the Federal Reserve Board; it did not originate anywhere else. It was suggested by the Federal Reserve Board after a study of conditions which led them to the conclusion that it was important that the bill should be passed to facilitate the national banks in the smaller towns in themselves transacting the business required instead of having it go to the larger cities. That does not mean to New York. Take my own State, for example, they would go to Atlanta; they would not go to New York. The smaller national banks were handicapped in their work. Under this bill they can make the advances, limited to six months, upon goods that are to be turned over at once; goods that usually do not last in the warehouse 30 days. They can handle the transaction locally, and if they have not all the money they want, instead of sending the borrower to the city of Atlanta, the local bank itself does the business, and goes to the city of Atlanta and gets there the credit if it needs it.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KELLOGG. Will the Senator give the information as to whether all the members of the Federal Reserve Board favored this measure?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. So far as I understand; yes.

Mr. KELLOGG. I doubt that very much.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand that it came with the unanimous recommendation of the Federal Reserve Board. It originated with them; it went to the House; it was studied by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, was adopted by them, and passed by the House. The bill then came here, and, after hearing Gov. Harding discuss it fully, the Senate committee approved it. I know nothing about the origin of the bill; I know nothing about it except what I have heard from Gov. Harding and what I have learned from a few letters from small national banks urging its value to them.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, every time we get a recommendation from the Federal Reserve Board it is for expansion, for additional power to issue money and to discount. That is one of the very reasons I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is it not true that there is a great deal of curtailment in the amount of Federal reserve notes now? Are they not being reduced?

Mr. KELLOGG. They are right now; but there has not been from the time the law was enacted up to the present time. We have passed two or three laws in the last three years that give them an opportunity to increase the circulating medium.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota knows that there is a remedy at hand which the Federal Reserve Board can use at any time if they want to contract the currency.

Mr. KELLOGG. I know there is; but they will not use it.

Mr. McLEAN. That is not the fault of this bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. They do not use it; they are always coming here asking for legislation to give them an opportunity to expand. There is not a part of this country that can not, by spreading its credits over the country generally, handle the crops; but when a section of the country which produces one great staple like wheat or cotton wishes to finance the entire crop in one local community, of course, it can not be done; and it is not safe to do it. It ought to be spread over the country. That is the object of having the restriction upon national banks.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in relation to the aggregate of Federal reserve notes outstanding, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that they now amount

to \$2,875,259,000. That was the report on September 29. So they are not decreasing the circulation very rapidly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think it would be very dangerous for them to do so now.

Mr. SMOOT. That is another question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I said the tendency was now toward curtailment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator state what the amount was a year ago?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from New York that the amount last year was \$2,869,330,550.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That was a year ago?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it was just about the same as it is now.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KELLOGG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baile	Gay	Lodge	Shields
Bankhead	Gerry	McKellar	Simmons
Beckham	Gore	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Gronna	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Brandeggee	Hale	Moses	Smith, Md.
Calder	Harding	New	Smoot
Capper	Harris	Newberry	Spencer
Chamberlain	Harrison	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Henderson	Nugent	Swanson
Cummins	Hitchcock	Overman	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Townsend
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Penrose	Trammell
Dillingham	Kellogg	Phelan	Underwood
Edge	Kendrick	Phipps	Wadsworth
Elkins	Kenyon	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	Keyes	Polindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Kirby	Pomerene	Warren
Fletcher	Knox	Ransdell	Watson
France	La Follette	Robinson	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Sheppard	Wolcott

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. POMERENE. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). In the absence of my pair, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMACK] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. STANLEY] is detained from the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 28, as follows:

## YEAS—51.

Ashurst	Fall	McKellar	Shields
Bankhead	Fletcher	McLean	Simmons
Beckham	Gay	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Brandeggee	Gore	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Gronna	Myers	Smith, Md.
Capper	Harris	Overman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Harrison	Owen	Trammell
Colt	Henderson	Penrose	Underwood
Culberson	Hitchcock	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Jones, N. M.	Polindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Kendrick	Ransdell	Williams
Dial	Keyes	Robinson	Wolcott
Edge	Kirby	Sheppard	

## NAYS—28.

Baile	Hale	Lodge	Pomerene
Borah	Harding	New	Smoot
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Spencer
Elkins	Kellogg	Norris	Townsend
France	Kenyon	Nugent	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Phelan	Warren
Gerry	Lenroot	Phipps	Watson



## NOT VOTING—17.

Fernald	McCormick	Reed	Sutherland
Johnson, Calif.	McCumber	Sherman	Thomas
Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin	Smith, S. C.	
King	Nelson	Stanley	
Knox	Page	Sterling	

So the bill was passed.

## RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

Mr. NEW. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7417.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7417) to amend an act of Congress approved March 12, 1914, authorizing the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, this bill amending the act of March 12, 1914, carries with it an authorization for an appropriation of \$17,000,000 additional, which is necessary for the completion of 601 miles of railroad in Alaska, the construction of which was undertaken under the original act. Thirty-five million dollars was appropriated in the original act, all of which has now been expended, except a balance of a very little in excess of \$2,000,000 on the 1st of August of this year, and that \$2,000,000 will have been expended by the end of this building season, which has really been reached at this time.

There are 2,500 men at present engaged in work along the line of the road. The main line, which runs from Seward, Alaska, to Fairbanks, Alaska, is a little over 400 miles in length. In addition to that line, there are branches of varying lengths—one to Matanuska, one to Chatanika, and one to Chena—aggregating, with sidetracks and switches, nearly 200 miles. Most of the work on the two ends of the main line has been done. They began at Seward, on the south, and built north 265 miles. Most of that work is completed. Then they began at Fairbanks, on the northern end, and built south to mile 365, and the most of that work is completed; but on the 100 miles between mile 265 and mile 365 nothing at all has been done beyond the work of surveying and clearing the right of way. The cost of the road to date exceeds the estimate by about 31 per cent; and the committee felt that, in view of the great increase in the cost of material and the cost of labor, which everybody realizes and recognizes, it is not a bad showing.

The \$35,000,000 that has thus far been expended is, of course, money lost unless the road is completed. The company is out of funds entirely, and this money is absolutely necessary for the completion of that project.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NEW. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely wish to suggest, in this connection, that the Senate Committee on Appropriations, upon a showing made to it at the last session, I think it was, recognized the situation and the need of more money, and put in a provision for \$10,000,000 in excess of the \$35,000,000 estimated, and it was passed by the Senate; but in conference the House conferees, because it exceeded the authorization, insisted upon that part going out. So the Senate, as a matter of fact, has really passed upon this question, in line with the report and the statements the Senator has made, and the Senate has approved the appropriation of \$10,000,000 to carry on the work.

Mr. NEW. That is true. If there is any further information desired by anyone, I will be very glad to give it if I can.

Mr. THOMAS. May I inquire of the Senator whether the amount carried by the bill will be sufficient for the purpose?

Mr. NEW. I am assured by the Secretary of the Interior and by the engineers of the Department of the Interior that it will be sufficient to complete the project.

Mr. THOMAS. I certainly hope their assurances will be verified, but I am just a little skeptical.

Mr. NEW. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I do not wonder at his skepticism. These projects almost always require additional appropriations, and this is no exception to the rule; but I really think, and the committee thought, that there is justification for this, because when the original estimate was made nobody could foresee the great increases in the cost of material and in the cost of labor, and the experience of the parties responsible for these estimates differs in no respect from the experience of those who have been in charge of any business and every business enterprise during the last two or three years.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President—

Mr. NEW. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I wish the Senator would tell us, if he knows, what portion of the road is now in operation.

Mr. NEW. None of it is really in operation.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. What portion of it has been completed?

Mr. NEW. It is completed for the most part from Seward north to mile 265, and they are operating a part of that road. It is very nearly complete from Fairbanks, on the north, which is 401 miles north of Seward, south as far as mile 365. Then the branch from the main line out to Matanuska, which is 37.7 miles, is practically completed. The Chatanika branch, which is a narrow-gauge branch of just a little under 32 miles, is completed. So are most of the sidings and terminals along the first 265 miles north from Seward and the 136 miles from Fairbanks south.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. So there is no reason why, if there was any business there, this southern portion of the road, with its branches, should not be in operation?

Mr. NEW. I think not.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. What business is there for the road to do?

Mr. NEW. There are a number of really very fertile valleys along the line of that road, in which a good many homesteaders have settled. There are nearly 500 families of homesteaders, in the aggregate, in those valleys. They are engaging in the ordinary agricultural pursuits and some stockraising. It has been demonstrated that agriculture can be carried on successfully and remuneratively up there if they can just get to a market, and this road is required for that.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Did it appear before the committee whether the white population of Alaska had increased or decreased in the last 15 years?

Mr. NEW. Yes; I think the white population of Alaska really has decreased in the last 15 years. But if the Senator will permit, I would like, by way of further answer to that question, to say that it was urged upon the committee that the chief reason for the loss of population in the section of Alaska through which this road runs has been the lack of communication with the outside. Take Fairbanks, for instance, which is on the Tanana River. It has for a great part of the year no way of communicating with the outside world except by dog sleds.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. It lies between the Tanana River and the Yukon?

Mr. NEW. Yes.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Is it not true that Fairbanks is the center of the best part of Alaska, agriculturally?

Mr. NEW. I think probably the best part of it is a little south of that; but certainly Fairbanks is in a good part of Alaska.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Does the Senator remember what is the white population of Fairbanks?

Mr. NEW. Fairbanks now has somewhere around 2,500 inhabitants, which is not as many as it did have.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I made these inquiries of the Senator perhaps more from curiosity than anything else. I voted against the original act for building this railroad because I thought it was a foolish venture for the Government, and I am not at all surprised that they have asked for this additional appropriation. I have no idea that the road will ever pay its running expenses, from what I know of the territory, having traveled over it pretty extensively.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, that may all be true. I think the Senator might well justify his vote originally against the project; but he would have more difficulty in justifying a vote now against the completion of it, in view of what has been expended and the present conditions. At least, I felt that way about it myself, and the committee so felt.

That is the situation with reference to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Has the bill been read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has not been read.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I would like to hear the bill read.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That evidently will make it impossible to dispose of the bill before 2 o'clock.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I supposed a Senator could demand the reading of a bill as a matter of right. Really, a bill should be read, I think, before speeches upon it are made. But I will be satisfied, if the bill is printed in the RECORD, to let the Senator from Georgia proceed.

Mr. NEW. The bill can be read in 15 seconds.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What I desire is to use the five minutes between now and 2 o'clock, together with the five min-



utes I will have under the unanimous-consent agreement, to present some reservations to the treaty with Germany. Unfortunately, I was absent yesterday when unanimous consent was given, and unless I present them now, I shall have no opportunity to do so.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator is entitled to his five minutes, as he has stated, when the first of the Fall amendments is reached, at 2 o'clock. He can then read his reservations.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I now ask unanimous consent that the reservations, when presented, may be printed for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will not the Senator allow action on the pending bill?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was just going to say that, if necessary, I can use several periods of five minutes. I can perhaps get through in five minutes later on, and I will not occupy the time until 2 o'clock, because Senators seem to be ready to vote.

Mr. NEW. I think the bill can be gotten out of the way in a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," be amended by inserting at the conclusion of section 2 the following:*

*"Provided, That in order to complete on or before December 31, 1922, the construction and equipment of the railroad between Seward and Fairbanks, together with necessary sidings, spurs, and lateral branches, the additional sum of \$17,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be immediately and continuously available until expended."*

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gay	McCormick	Robinson
Ball	Gerry	McCumber	Sheppard
Bankhead	Gronna	McKellar	Shields
Borah	Hale	McLean	Simmons
Brandeggee	Harding	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Harris	Moses	Smith, Md.
Capper	Harrison	New	Smoot
Chamberlain	Henderson	Newberry	Spencer
Colt	Hitchcock	Norris	Stanley
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sterling
Cummins	Kellogg	Overman	Thomas
Curtis	Kendrick	Owen	Trammell
Dial	Kenyon	Penrose	Underwood
Dillingham	Keyes	Phelan	Wadsworth
Edge	Knox	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	La Follette	Pittman	Warren
Fall	Lenroot	Polindexter	Watson
Fernald	Lodge	Pomerene	Wolcott

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

#### TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on the 1st day of October, the Chair lays before the Senate the German treaty, to be considered as provided by the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I presume the Senate is now in open executive session, although no motion to that effect has been made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that entering upon the execution of the unanimous-consent agreement necessarily passes the Senate into open executive session.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia addressed the Senate for five minutes. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. When the next amendment is before the Senate I shall conclude what I have to say, which will not take more than five minutes longer.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I have nothing to say on the pending amendment at this time, but I desire to announce that the French Chamber of Deputies has just ratified the treaty by a vote of 372 to 52.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this is the proper occasion to give the Senate my reasons for the vote which I shall cast against the amendment. My view of that part of the treaty which affects Germany—

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. STANLEY. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. THOMAS. I shall have to yield for that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has just made the statement that the French Chamber of Deputies has, by an almost unanimous vote, ratified the treaty. Is there any rule against applause in the galleries at that momentous statement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. According to the rule announced by the permanent occupant of the chair, there is a rule against applause in the galleries, and the present occupant of the chair concurs with the permanent occupant of the chair in that construction of the rule.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I decline to yield further. I have only five minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. I believe, Mr. President, that the indemnity exacted of Germany should have been laid in what has been generally known as a lump sum. I believe it would have been better for Germany, better for the Allies, and far better from the standpoint of treaty administration. That, however, has not been done, and the treaty provisions regarding it require administration or they will not be effective. It would hardly be fair for the Government of the United States to participate in the making of such a treaty and then refuse to bear its share of the work and expense of making the requirements of the treaty effective. Moreover, Mr. President, we have, since America's entrance into the war, particularly upon this floor, recognized the claims of Poland, the Czecho-Slovaks, and the Jugoslavs to independence, based upon the principle of self-determination. The delimitation of the boundaries of those countries also imposes other conditions upon us quite distinct from German indemnity which we should recognize. Having created, or assisted in creating, these governments, it is not American to leave them upon the principle that once delimited they shall assume the obligations of self-support and go it alone or not go at all. It is not possible to conceive two sides to that proposition.

I shall, for the reasons thus briefly and imperfectly outlined, cast my vote against the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I shall vote against this amendment and probably against all of the amendments in this series. I shall vote against this amendment because I have no objection to the participation of the United States upon these commissions, provided the reservations that will be made to this treaty, if it be ratified at all, will relieve the United States from the obligations that would otherwise follow; but I see no objection whatever to the United States sitting as a disinterested party, if our associates desire them to do so, upon these commissions.

The article to which the pending amendment applies provides for a commission of seven to determine the boundaries between Belgium and Germany. If our associates desire the United States to participate in the settlement of that question, which is a judicial question very largely, why should we refuse to do so? Of course, if these were the only changes that were to be made in the treaty, if there were to be no reservations of any kind adopted, I would agree that this amendment ought to be agreed to, because I am opposed to the United States attempting to dictate the boundaries of Europe anywhere, whether it be in Italy, Belgium, or France; for the nation that dictates the boundaries of a country ought also to assume the obligation of defending those boundaries. I am not willing to assume any such obligation; and I apprehend, Mr. President, that when the treaty goes out from this body, with such reservations as will make it plain to our associates that the United States in ratifying the treaty declines to assume any obligation to preserve the territorial integrity of any member of the league, declines to assume any obligation to utilize the military and naval forces of this country for any such purpose, our place upon these commissions, instead of being one of a dictatorship, will be one of an advisory character, as it ought to be. I am also confident that we shall have an opportunity, when the proper time shall arrive, of voting for a reservation with reference



to these particular matters that will permit the United States to withdraw from any of these commissions at any time or from any of the obligations that may flow from participation in them; and, furthermore, that with reference to whether we shall participate or not, it shall be a matter for the Congress of the United States to determine and not the Executive alone.

I believe that if the United States shall be of any assistance upon the proposed commissions the representatives of the United States thereon must be men who are not sycophants, who are not entirely unknown, but they must be men of known ability and distinction, and we can secure such men if the Senate shall be given the power to confirm any nominations which may be made to those commissions.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he knows the caliber of the men who are likely to be appointed on the commissions provided for in the treaty? At this time I am told that a man who was formerly an employee of the State Department at a salary of about \$3,000 a year is receiving \$30,000 as a member of one of those commissions.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I understand that to be the fact; but until this treaty is ratified by the Senate of the United States and the ratifications shall have been exchanged, so as to make it a complete contract, I do not understand that the appointment of any man upon any one of those commissions is worth the paper upon which it is written.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, as I read article 35, to which this amendment applies, it does not necessarily follow that the United States need have membership upon the commission at all. The article provides that there shall be a commission of seven men, in the appointment of five of whom the United States with the other principal allied and associated powers shall join; but it does not necessarily follow, unless we so desire, that one of the appointees shall be an American.

What does the pending amendment do? It asserts that in the solution of the problem of determining the frontier between Belgium and Germany, a problem which arises solely out of the war, the United States refuses, even though there is no obligation imposed, even though there is no burden of money or of men, to associate itself with its former associates in helping to solve one of the very problems which it helped to create.

Why do our associates in the war want the United States to have a part in the selection of this commission? They want the United States to have a part in the selection of this commission because we are the great independent stabilizing factor of the world. Because we have no greed of land or power; because we are impartial. All that is asked in this article of the treaty is that the helpful judgment of the United States—an independent and impartial Nation—shall be joined with the judgment of our allies in the solution of one of the problems that have arisen out of this war. It seems to me, Mr. President, that a decent regard for the wishes and difficulties of our associates in the war requires this country to cooperate in this service; and I shall therefore vote against the amendment.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCER. With pleasure.

Mr. McCORMICK. Does the Senator mean that he believes that impartiality necessarily inheres in the representatives of the United States?

Mr. SPENCER. If we are true to the traditions and history of this country, it ought to inhere; and it certainly does inhere more than in the case of any other country in the solution of post-war problems.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator says, "If true to the traditions of the United States"; but does he mean that impartiality necessarily and inevitably and always inheres in the representatives of the United States?

Mr. SPENCER. Sometimes not.

Mr. McCORMICK. I had in mind the Shantung incident.

Mr. SPENCER. Sometimes not; but that, Mr. President, is the fault of the individual. The fault or inefficiency of an individual has no effect upon the correctness of the principle.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I was one of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations which voted to report favorably this and the other so-called Fall amendments, consisting, I believe, of about 34, the purpose of which is, before the word "powers," to strike out the words "and associated," wherever they occur in this portion of the treaty.

The article in which the pending amendment is proposed is article 35, reading as follows:

"A commission of seven persons, five of whom will be appointed by the principal allied and associated powers, one by Germany, and one by Belgium, will be set up 15 days after the coming into force of the present treaty to settle on the spot

the new frontier line between Belgium and Germany, taking into account the economic factors and the means of communication.

"Decisions will be taken by a majority, and will be binding on the parties concerned."

The pending Fall amendment is to strike out the words "and associated," which would take the United States out of the business of determining the boundaries between Germany and Belgium.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] has just stated that this article does not compel the United States to take part in the decision. That is true; the article provides only for the appointment of a commission of seven, and does not provide that the United States shall necessarily have a member upon the commission; but the latter part of the statement of the Senator from Missouri, it seemed to me, was rather inconsistent with the claim that we would have nothing to do with the decisions of the commission, because, if I correctly understood the Senator from Missouri, he stated that he thought it was practically our duty to participate in what he called the solution, to use his own term, of these European questions.

Mr. President, that is just where I differ not only with the Senator from Missouri but with every Senator who desires, under the name of an "associated power," to keep us involved in the settlement of all such questions on the continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa, which are now pending and which may grow out of the infinite complications brought about by this tremendous five years' war.

I do not see why the United States must be a member of these 35 commissions to determine these European questions, about which we know nothing and in which we are only most remotely interested, Mr. President; and if we are not to sit there with delegates and help determine them, at some times in commissions constituted as this one is, where our vote would be decisive in case of a tie, I do not see why we are to participate in the decision of these questions.

I, for one, utterly repel the allegation that it is our moral or bounden duty to mix up in these affairs at all. Some of these commissions will last for 30 years; and I decline to vote to bind this country to participate for these indefinite periods of time in either the appointment or the membership of commissions which shall be engaged in this work for years after the termination of this war and after the settlement of the animosities and the feelings which have arisen out of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think after the history of the last five years nobody can doubt that when the world needs the services of the United States for the protection of civilization and freedom, it will have it; but, Mr. President, it is a very different thing to expect the United States to enter into every boundary dispute and take part in "stabilizing," as the Senator from Missouri suggested, I suppose after the manner in which we have just stabilized the question of Fiume.

Mr. President, in my judgment this treaty never will be ratified unless the Monroe doctrine is finally and absolutely reserved from the jurisdiction of the league. In other words, the United States does not propose, if it can help it, to permit Europe to come in here to settle our boundaries or any purely American question. If we are going to take that attitude—and we shall, in my opinion, if this treaty is to be ratified—they can easily retort that we desire to have the right to interfere in their affairs, while we do not propose that they shall interfere in ours.

I have as little desire to interfere in the boundaries of the European countries, beyond maintaining the decisions of the conference as they are agreed to at this time, as I have to have them interfere in ours. I do not see why we should take up the burden of settling boundaries all over Europe. Leave it to Europe to do. If we had gone there and said to them: "All we ask is that we shall make a treaty with Germany which will prevent her from ever being a menace to the world again; arrange your own boundaries and your partitions among yourselves, and we will back you up, but we will not meddle, if you will comply with our wish that Germany shall be rendered harmless," we should be as strong, as popular, and as well regarded in Europe to-day as we were when the war closed instead of being disliked and distrusted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the sum-total of the argument made by the Senator from Massachusetts amounts to this: That we announce to the world, or rather he announces to the world, that "if the world wants America at any time in the cause of the independence and peace of small nations or the liberty of the world, she can have her"; and then, in the next



breath, he announces that now, when he is met with the first chance to make good that statement, he declines. Then he tells us that we do not want to fix boundaries in Europe. Well, we have already fixed them. Everybody in America wants to recognize the independence from Turkey of Palestine and Armenia and Thrace, and from Austria-Hungary of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and the independence from all three of the great autocratic powers of Poland. Then the Senator tells us that after we have already done all that we must have nothing to do with their boundaries! We have already, in the treaty, fixed the boundaries. No State can be recognized or exist without boundaries; none of these amendments change the boundaries; they simply say that we, having helped fix them, shall have nothing to do with securing them.

Just prior to that came along the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], and the Senator from Connecticut, in substance, said that while we fixed these terms and these independencies and these nationalities, and therefore these boundaries, we might be kept in Europe a few years, and therefore we ought to stand out from under. I humbly submit that the United States are not in the habit of standing out from under where they have already taken a position. We have already taken a position in favor of the freedom and independence of Poland, of Bohemia, of Bosnia, of Herzegovina, of Hejaz, of Serbia, of Armenia, whose poor people have been massacred since the first gospel was preached to them by a Christian apostle, and we have taken a position in favor of self-government of Palestine, the home of the chosen race, as they consider themselves, the Jews; and yet the Senator cynically remarked that we might have to stay several years—doing what? Making good our word, that is all; making good the wounds and the deaths and the sufferings of our boys in France, and of our boys in Italy.

Mr. President, I do not believe American citizenry has reached the low level which is here depicted. It does seem to me that when a man says, "The world knows that when she wants America in behalf of liberty and in behalf of the rights of small nationalities, the world can have her," and then, when he is faced with the very first opportunity that ever was furnished for America to do just what he says "the world knows" she will do, and when he follows up his previous utterance by the practical advice of quitting the game just as soon as possible, he is doing a rather inconsistent thing; and yet that is all that was contained in the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts. "Lame and impotent conclusion" for one supposed to lead a great American party! That is also, after analysis, all that was contained in the speech of the Senator from Connecticut. There is not another idea in either except "stand out from under." Stand out from under what? Something that somebody else has forced upon us? No; something we have fought and bled for, just as these gentlemen who want to defeat the league of nations want to stand out from under all the endeavors to secure an ultimate and just and enduring peace among the nations of the world, and among the sons and daughters of men.

"Am I my brother's keeper?" Cain inquired; and God replied, substantially, "Yes; to some extent you are."

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am opposed to any amendment to this treaty. There are some provisions in it which I do not like. If they turn out to be what we do not want we can get out from under the treaty in two years, or we can amend it in the method provided for. Our duty in Europe has not been ended.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] always speaks learnedly and eloquently on any subject to which he addresses himself. The situation to-day in this Chamber is not unlike that which existed here during the consideration of the Spanish-American treaty; and I want to call attention very briefly to the utterances of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts on that occasion, and commend his thoughts then to those who are seeking to have this treaty defeated and to return our commissioners to Europe.

When the Spanish-American treaty was before the Senate the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said:

I believe that we shall have the courage not to depart from those islands—

The Philippines—

fearfully, timidly, and unworthily and leave them to anarchy among themselves, to the brief and bloody domination of some self-constituted dictator, and to the quick conquest of other powers, who will have no such hesitation as we should feel in crushing them into subjection by harsh and repressive methods. It is for us to decide the destiny of the Philippines, not for Europe, and we can do it alone and without assistance. I believe that we shall have the wisdom, the self-restraint, and the ability to restore peace and order in those islands and give to their people an opportunity for self-government and for freedom under the protecting shield of the United States until the time shall come when they are able to stand alone, if such a thing be possible, and if they do not themselves desire to remain under our protection.

Let us apply that sentiment to the new-born nations of Europe to-day.

This is a great, a difficult, and a noble task. I believe that American civilization is entirely capable of fulfilling it, and I should not have that profound faith which I now cherish in American civilization and American manhood if I did not think so.

During the campaign of last autumn I said in many speeches to the people of my State that I could never assent to hand those islands back to Spain; that I wanted no subject races and vassal States; but that we had by the fortunes of war assumed a great responsibility in the Philippines; that we ought to meet it, and that we ought to give to those people an opportunity for freedom, for peace, and for self-government; that we ought to protect them from the rapacity of other nations and seek to uplift those whom we had freed. From those views I have never swerved, and I believed then, as I believe now, that they met with the approbation of an overwhelming majority of the people of Massachusetts. I believe those results can be and will be obtained.

I commend that sentiment to the Senator from Massachusetts so far as it applies to the new-born nations.

Suppose we reject the treaty; what follows? Let us look at it practically. We continue the state of war, and every sensible man in the country, every business interest, desires the reestablishment of peace in law as well as in fact. At the same time we repudiate the President and his action before the whole world, and the repudiation of the President in such a matter as this is, to my mind, the humiliation of the United States in the eyes of civilized mankind.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. POMERENE. Very well; I will suspend until the next amendment is reached.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I, too, intend to vote against the Fall amendments, but not entirely for the reasons given by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER].

I do not like the provisions of the treaty to which the amendments have been offered, and I am in sympathy with the amendments and should vote for them did I not believe that the same purpose can be accomplished by reservations. I expect to vote for reservations later on which will take care of these matters. I believe that these reservations can provide that it shall be optional with us not only as to whether we shall serve on these commissions, but as to whether we shall take any part in making them up. I further think that we can provide by a reservation that no man from this country shall be a member of any of these commissions without the consent of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, in 1917, when Germany, suffering from the blows she was then receiving from the Allies, began to put out feelers to see what could be done in the matter of a peaceful settlement of this war, the most eloquent appeal that was made on the floor of the Senate at that time, and the one which received the approbation of every Senator on this floor, was the declaration of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as to what the United States would demand from Germany as conditions of peace.

What were those demands? First, that the United States would demand the return of Alsace and Lorraine to France. Second, that the United States would demand that Turkey be put out of Europe. Third, that the United States would demand a new country, a Jugo-Slavic country and a Czecho-Slavic country, be placed upon the map of Europe. Again, that the United States would demand reparation from Germany for all the offenses that she had committed against the rules of honorable warfare.

Now, we have carried the war to that final conclusion in which we are able to make good the demands which were made by the Senator from Massachusetts. We will see that Alsace and Lorraine go back to France. There will be little difficulty in determining the borders of those two Provinces. But we had to create a new country—a new Czechoslovakia. We had to create a new Poland, and we who were the followers of the Senator from Massachusetts in those demands, all understood at that time, that if we created those countries we would have to create boundaries, and if they were to be created through the war power of the United States, and after our soldiers had gone down to death to establish the right of the United States to so determine what Germany should do, we understand it would require a commission to fix those boundaries.

And it was understood, Mr. President, that the United States, the great country which most of us claim really won the war, would have something to say with reference to how those countries should be established, and what their boundaries should be.

It was further understood by all of us, who agreed so earnestly with the Senator from Massachusetts, that there should be reparation for those wrongs so committed by Germany; that some commission would have to ascertain what the reparation should be. We all understood that the United States



would be represented in determining what should be just and fair as a matter of reparation.

I have not changed in my attitude of earnest support of the Senator from Massachusetts in everything he then said. I believe as earnestly to-day as I believed then that this was the duty of the United States in this war, and that we should perform our duty; and if there is anything to be done in the settlement of these disputes, any questions of boundaries of the nations which we helped to create and bring into existence, it is our duty to assist in establishing those boundaries, our duty not to get away from the troubles and perplexities and anxieties that necessarily follow the establishment of new boundary lines of these newly created nations, but to shoulder the burden, and to shoulder it honestly and fearlessly. No harm will ever come to this country because of its purpose to do its duty to the very last requirement in the final settlement of every question imposed upon us by the victorious ending of this Great War.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, if we might get to the subject at issue for just a moment, I remind the Senator from Missouri that one greater even than he has spoken already as to our participation in this particular boundary question. The President of the United States, in answer to a direct question, has said:

It was deemed wise that the United States should be represented by one member of the commission for settling the new frontier lines of Belgium and Germany because of the universal opinion that America's representative would add to the commission a useful element of entirely disinterested judgment.

Mr. President, I would also recommend that one or two of the Senators at least read part third, with reference to the boundaries of Belgium, and ascertain just what this commission is supposed to do. Such reading will disclose the fact that the commission is not only charged with a ministerial duty, but also with the exercise of judgment for the present in settling the boundaries and hereafter in fixing them, after a plebiscite may be held and the report of that plebiscite communicated to the league of nations.

Of course, Mr. President, if I had been aware of the fact that some Senators would favor a reservation which would do exactly what these amendments were proposed to do with reference to this commission, I would have been even more insistent than I have insisted heretofore that the orderly procedure was to vote upon article 1 of the treaty, and then on any reservations to the treaty, before we reached the amendments under the text of the treaty itself. I am aware of the fact, of course, that certain statements have been made to Senators here who desire to support the amendments, that the same result exactly would be obtained by reservations to be hereafter offered, and which would be adopted.

Mr. President, I have absolutely no pride of authorship whatsoever. If the same results can be obtained through the efforts of other Senators in writing reservations into the treaty, I shall most cheerfully vote for such reservations. My purpose is the perfectly sincere one of seeing that the United States has nothing to do with the fixing of the boundary lines between Belgium and Germany further than to agree to them as fixed in this treaty, and that she should not take part in it. The United States has been criticized by the civilized world for the fact that she did not enforce with Germany a treaty which she had entered into for the protection of Belgium heretofore. Now, you are not only proposing a further neutralization treaty, but you are distinctly taking part in the fixing of certain specific lines and obligating yourself hereafter never to change.

In so far as the general statement made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is concerned, and in view of the fact that he seemed to be laboring under the impression that the proposed amendments referred simply to boundary commissions, I may say to him that of the entire number of some 34, 4 and 4 only apply to boundary commissions; and the purpose of each of those as applied to boundary commissions is just exactly what I avow my purpose here now, to see that the United States has nothing to do with boundary lines and does not pledge herself to a moral or legal obligation hereafter to send her troops there and stand them across those lines to preserve them eternally.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I can not, of course, in the time permitted, discuss these amendments. I shall simply say a very few words in explanation of my vote against the amendments proposed.

The associated and allied powers defeated Germany in the greatest, the most devastating, and criminal war ever waged by an aspiring monarchy, and I am willing, as I was willing to go into the war, that this country should do everything it can to make that victory complete and to see that Germany pays reparation to the bitter end to make that victory effectual. I am not willing to withdraw this country from the reparation com-

mission. I am not willing that this country should stand aside and say that it is not going to see that Germany is disarmed and rendered powerless to again perpetrate upon the world such a crime. I am willing to go to the extent necessary to make that victory complete. I know the terms are harsh, but the crime was great, the greatest ever known in history against the civilization of the world. Should we hesitate now to stand with the Allies and see that Germany is rendered powerless?

During the war, when the result was in doubt, and the world shuddered at the consequences if Germany should win, we were more than willing to encourage Poland, Hungary, and other nations in Europe to set up an independent government and to avail ourselves of their assistance and of their help in defeating Germany. I say now, go to the extent necessary to see that they are set up as an independent people.

I know Senators upon this floor stated there must be an independent Poland on the east of Prussia. Is there anything startling in the statement that we, as one of the allied and associated powers which made it possible, should run the boundaries or assist in it? I think not.

We were willing, then, in the dark days of the war, to avail ourselves of their assistance. Now, it is said we should abandon Europe. I am as anxious to avoid Europe and its quarrels as anyone. I wish it had been possible for us to say, "Arrange these matters among yourselves. We have done our part." But it was not done, and I am not now willing to vote for amendments which will relieve us entirely. I do not say that I would not vote for an amendment which would give us the option of withdrawing when the time comes wherein we consider it proper to withdraw from these commissions. In fact, in most of them we are not obliged to nominate a representative of this country at all. I think perhaps such a reservation would be wise, but I am not willing now to vote for these amendments which practically represent new treaty provisions upon the subject.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if a vote is about to be taken, I desire to ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to offer just one word of explanation as to the vote on the pending amendment that I intend to cast. I believe in the principle of the amendment, but I feel positive it can be covered by a reservation, and I prefer a reservation to an amendment; and I understand a form of reservation has been prepared covering this amendment and the other so-called Fall amendments. As we will have a chance to vote for the reservation, I shall vote against the pending amendment, but shall vote for the reservation referred to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BECKHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote I would vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "yea."

Mr. SWANSON (when Mr. MARTIN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. MARTIN] is detained on account of illness. He is paired with the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. If my colleague were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. PAGE's name was called). I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] on account of illness. Were he present he would vote "yea."

Mr. DIAL (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. If my colleague were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). As stated by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] I have a general pair with the senior Senator from that State [Mr. SMITH]. Under the announcement of the junior Senator from South Carolina, that if his colleague were present he would vote "nay," I am at liberty to vote upon this amendment. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."



Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] on account of illness in his family. If he were present, he would vote "nay." The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 58, as follows:

## YEAS—30.

Ball	Fernald	Lodge	Phipps
Borah	France	McCormick	Polindexter
Brandeggee	Frelinghuysen	McLean	Sherman
Calder	Gore	Moses	Wadsworth
Curtis	Gronna	New	Warren
Dillingham	Harding	Newberry	Watson
Elkins	Knox	Norris	
Fall	La Follette	Penrose	

## NAYS—58.

Ashurst	Harrison	Nelson	Smoot
Bankhead	Henderson	Nugent	Spencer
Beckham	Hitchcock	Overman	Stanley
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Swanson
Colt	Kellogg	Pittman	Thomas
Culberson	Kendrick	Pomerene	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Ransdell	Trammell
Dial	Keyes	Robinson	Underwood
Edge	Kirby	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Lenroot	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	McCumber	Simmons	Williams
Gerry	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Hale	McNary	Smith, Ga.	
Harris	Myers	Smith, Md.	

## NOT VOTING—8.

Johnson, Calif.	King	Page	Smith, S. C.
Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin	Reed	Sutherland

So Mr. FALL'S amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 61, line 5, in article 40, it is proposed, after the word "allied," to strike out the words "and associated," so as to make it read, "allied powers."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee as stated by the Secretary.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, that there may be no misunderstanding and that Senators if they desire to speak upon it may have their attention called to the purpose and effect of the proposed amendment, I will state briefly that it is provided in the portion of the treaty now under consideration and in the article to which the amendment refers that Germany renounces the benefits of certain treaties with the Duchy of Luxemburg; that she "renounces all rights to the exploitation of the railways in Luxemburg, adheres to the termination of the régime of neutrality of the Grand Duchy, and accepts in advance all international arrangements which may be concluded by the allied powers relating to the Grand Duchy." The amendment simply provides that the United States shall not take part in any such future arrangements. It strikes out the United States.

I may say while I am on my feet that article 41 also applies to Luxemburg and provides that Germany will agree to have any of the other provisions of the present treaty applied to Luxemburg at the demand of the allied and associated powers. The amendment there is to strike out the words "and associated."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia addressed the Senate for five minutes. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will conclude my remarks on the next amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, with relation to this provision and the other provisions covered by the Fall amendments, I desire to submit a few of the precepts laid down by Thomas Jefferson, the progenitor of the Democratic Party and politically of the present occupant of the White House. What Washington said has been often quoted, what Jefferson said has been strangely neglected at this, of all moments, when it applies so directly. Jefferson for some 40 years spoke and wrote consistently against such conventions being entered into on our part. I now quote from his writings:

"I know that it is a maxim with us, and I think it a wise one, not to entangle ourselves with the affairs of Europe." (To E. Carrington (Paris, 1787). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, ii, 334. Ford edition, iv, 483.)

"Better keep together as we are, haul off from Europe as soon as we can and from all attachments to any portions of it." (To John Taylor (Philadelphia, 1798). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 247. Ford edition, vii, 205.)

"I am for free commerce with all nations, political connection with none, and little or no diplomatic establishment. And I am not for linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe." (To Elbridge Gerry (Philadelphia, 1790). The

Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 268. Ford edition, vii, 328.)

"Commerce with all nations, alliance with none, should be our motto." (To T. Lomax (Monticello, March, 1799). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Washington edition, iv, 301. Ford edition, vii, 374.)

"I sincerely join you in abjuring all political connection with every foreign power; and though I cordially wish well to the progress of liberty in all nations, and would forever give it the weight of our countenance, yet they are not to be touched without contamination from their other bad principles." (To T. Lomax (Monticello, March, 1799). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 301. Ford edition, vii, 374.)

"Let our affairs be disentangled from those of all other nations except as to commerce." (To Gideon Granger (Monticello, 1800). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 331. Ford edition, vii, 452.)

"The Constitution thought it wise to restrain the Executive and Senate from entangling and embroiling our affairs with those of Europe." (Parliamentary Manuel ix, 81 (1800).)

"To take part in European conflicts would be to divert our energies from creation to destruction." (To George Logan (Washington, March, 1801). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Ford Edition, vii, 23.)

"It ought to be the very first object of our pursuits to have nothing to do with the European interests and politics. Let them be free or slaves, at will, navigators or agriculturists, swallowed into one government or divided into a thousand, we have nothing to fear from them in any form." (To George Logan (Washington, March, 1801). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Ford Edition, vii, 23.)

"Determined as we are to avoid, if possible, wasting the energies of our people in war and destruction, we shall avoid implicating ourselves with the powers of Europe, even in support of principles we mean to pursue. They have so many other interests different from ours that we must avoid being entangled in them. We believe we can enforce these principles, as to ourselves by peaceable means, now that we are likely to have our public councils detached from foreign views." (To Thomas Paine (Washington, March, 1801). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington Edition, iv, 370. Ford Edition, viii, 18.)

"Our Nation has wisely avoided entangling itself in the system of European interests, has taken no side between its rival powers, attached itself to none of its ever-changing confederacies." (Reply to Address of Baltimore Baptists (1808). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington Edition, viii, 137.)

"The seed of hatred and revenge which they are now sowing with a large hand will not fail to produce their fruits in time." (To M. de Marbois (Monticello, 1817). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Washington Edition, vii, 76.)

"Treaties of alliance are generally insufficient to enforce compliance with their mutual stipulations." (The Anas (1818), ix, 88. The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Ford Edition, i, 157.)

"It is a theatrical farce—"

Speaking of the Holy Alliance—

"in which the five powers are the actors." (To President Monroe (Monticello, June, 1823). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington Edition, vii, 289. Ford Edition, x, 258.)

"It is against our system to entangle ourselves at all with the affairs of Europe." (To Philip Massei (Washington, 1824). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington Edition, iv, 553.)

Yet Jefferson, disliked by many then and now, as to his idealism, was at least as earnest, at least as well read, at least as experienced, at least as liberal, and at least as competent to judge human tendencies, and the results of human action as are any of the idealists of to-day. Nor has human nature, which remained unchanged through the centuries and persistently held its traits through many leagues of nations, altered in the last 100 years. Nor are world conditions to-day different from those of Jefferson's time, which was that of the overthrow of Napoleon, of the bankruptcy of Europe, of the threatened revolution in England, of the disorder and misery of the nations of the great convulsion of the nineteenth century, and of the founding for the same purposes of a league of nations, known as the Holy Alliance, to secure peace and guarantee the territorial integrity of the associated powers. Of it, to quote him finally, Jefferson says:

"With respect to the European combinations against the rights of man, I join an honest Irishman of my neighborhood in his Fourth of July toast, 'The Holy Alliance—To hell the whole of them.'" (To Thomas Leiper (Monticello, 1824). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Ford Edition, x, 298.)

The volume and page where these extracts from Jefferson occur are given in connection with the quotations.



Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to continue for two or three minutes to present the gospel according to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in 1899:

Suppose we reject the treaty; what follows? Let us look at it practically. We continue the state of war, and every sensible man in the country, every business interest, desires the reestablishment of peace in law as well as in fact. At the same time we repudiate the President and his action before the whole world, and the repudiation of the President in such a matter as this is, to my mind, the humiliation of the United States in the eyes of civilized mankind and brands us as a people incapable of great affairs or of taking rank where we belong, as one of the greatest of the great world powers.

The President can not be sent back across the Atlantic in the person of his commissioners, bat in hand, to say to Spain, with bated breath, "I am here in obedience to the mandate of a minority of one-third of the Senate to tell you that we have been too victorious, and that you have yielded us too much, and that I am very sorry I took the Philippines from you." I do not think that any American President would do that, or that any American would wish him to. Still less do I think that any American would withdraw Gen. Otis and his soldiers and recall Admiral Dewey from the scene of his great victory, leaving it to be said of us that we had deserted our post without an effort to repair the ruin we had made or to save the people we had freed with—

One task more declined, one more footpath untrod,

One more devil's triumph and sorrow for angels,

One wrong more to man, one more insult to God.

I believe in the rule of the majority, because I believe that in the long run the majority is far more likely to be right than the minority, and I have no faith in Matthew Arnold's self-complacent doctrine of "the remnant." Great policies and great questions must be decided by higher standards and on grounds more relative than this. I have given a large part of my life to the study of the time when this country freed itself from England, and when this Government was established, and of the men who did the great work. No one has a greater reverence for those men and their deeds than I. Nobody loves better than I the ideals set forth in the Declaration of Independence; but my ideals do not stop there. Nor do they stop even with that greater period when the life of the Nation was at stake. I have ideals and beliefs which pertain to the living present, and a faith in the future of my country. I believe in the American people as they are to-day, and in the civilization they have created. I believe not merely in what they have done but in what they are yet to do.

I can look at this question in only one way. A great responsibility has come to us. If we are unfit for it and unequal to it, then we should shirk it and fly from it. But I believe that we are both fit and capable, and that therefore we should meet it and take it up.

Later on in the same speech he uses this language:

I want to get this country out of war and back to peace.

That is my thought.

I want to take the disposition and control of the Philippines out of the hands of the war power and place them where they belong, in the hands of the Congress and of the President. I want to enter upon a policy which shall enable us to give peace and self-government to the natives of those islands.

That is what we want to do who favor this treaty now, namely, to give peace and self-government to the nations of Europe.

The rejection of the treaty makes all these things impossible, and the delay in its ratification retards and endangers them.

These quotations are taken from a speech delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts January 24, 1899, and found in volume 32 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 959 and 960.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, in addition to the very interesting statement with regard to the position of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] taken on the particular question then before the Senate, we have a very much later statement by the Senator which, it seems to me, is wholly in conflict with his present position. I desire to call attention to an address which he delivered in this body on December 21, 1918, a prepared address. I shall read only one or two extracts from it, but I commend it to those who have not read it as having a direct bearing on the very question now before us.

At page 760, the Senator said:

The first thing needful is to face the situation and look facts in the face. Nothing can be accomplished unless we work in complete harmony with those who are associated with us in the war against the Central Powers. I know very well that technically we had no treaty of alliance with the allies by whose side we fought, but technicalities are of no consequence in the presence of facts. No treaty of alliance could have caused a greater unity of action than was established between us and the nations with whom we joined in the war against Germany.

A little further down he says:

If these are fulfilled, then comes the practical work of making the peace effective. In other words, the terms of the peace must be carried out and executed. The United States did not enter this Great War simply to vindicate its rights at sea, which had been invaded and disregarded by the German use of submarines, although that may have been the last drop which caused the cup of wrong and outrage to overflow. It was no doubt the technical point on which relations were broken, but it was trifling compared to the really great objects with which we entered the war and which alone justified our doing so. We took up arms against Germany because we were determined not only to protect our own safety and independence against her attacks but because the people of the United States believed that if the world was to be a possible place for free, law-abiding people to live in the autocratic system and the organized barbarism of Germany must once for all be eliminated from among the nations. We went to war to save civilization. For this mighty purpose we have sacrificed thousands of

American lives and spent billions of American treasure. We can not, therefore, leave the work half done. We are as much bound, not merely by interest and every consideration for a safe future but by honor and self-respect, to see that the terms of peace are carried out, as we were to fulfill our great determination that the armies of Germany should be defeated in the field. We can not halt or turn back now. We must do our share to carry out the peace as we have done our share to win the war, of which the peace is an integral part. We must do our share in the occupation of German territory which will be held as security for the indemnities to be paid by Germany. We can not escape doing our part in aiding the peoples to whom we have helped to give freedom and independence in establishing themselves with ordered governments, for in no other way can we erect the barriers which are essential to prevent another outbreak by Germany upon the world. We can not leave the Jugo-Slavs, the Czechoslovaks, and the Poles, the Lithuanians, and the other States which we hope to see formed and marching upon the path of progress and development unaided and alone.

These are some of the tasks which the war has brought and which peace demands. They involve no alliances. They are specific questions, the settlement of which has been imposed upon us by the war, and they all are vital to an enduring peace. They ought to make the peace of the world. And behind the work of occupation to insure the payment of indemnities, behind these new States, whose existence we have recognized and whom we have helped to call into existence, lies the great problem of Russia.

And so forth. I quote LODGE against LODGE on this question.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, in view of my vote on amendment No. 3, I think perhaps I should say a word in explanation of my vote on the pending amendment.

Amendment No. 3 related to boundaries alone; and I think the United States would incur neither a legal nor a moral obligation in sharing in the appointment of this commission of seven to fix the Belgian boundaries, or in having a representative to serve on the commission itself. It is purely a question of boundary; and, Mr. President, if there is a legal or moral obligation to protect and preserve that boundary in article 35 itself, and on the face of it, we shall protect ourselves against that by the important and material reservation we shall make affecting article 10 of the covenant of the league of nations.

But, Mr. President, the pending amendment is a different thing altogether. This does not relate to boundaries alone. It assumes that the allied and the associated powers may make an international arrangement which will relate not alone to boundaries, but to any other subject which may affect international relations. It is not a question alone, then, of the interests of Luxemburg and Germany, respectively, but it may become a question that affects every power in Europe. Arising as they will out of an international arrangement concerning Luxemburg, although Luxemburg is small, territorially considered, the issues may be such in any given case as to involve every nation on the Continent of Europe in controversy, and possibly in war. It may involve us, because the "international arrangements" referred to in article 40 are those to which we are to be a party.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that our country should subscribe to that portion of article 40 in which this proposed amendment occurs; so, when it comes to a vote upon amendment No. 4, I shall vote, or would vote if permitted to do so—I announced my pair a while ago—in favor of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the committee in article 40, page 61.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, in view of the significance of the vote which was taken a few moments ago, and which makes it evident to the people of the United States that a treaty will be framed which will suit the Senate of the United States before it is ever adopted, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays upon this amendment, nor upon the next.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I call for the yeas and nays, Mr. President. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the committee in article 40, page 61. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for a division.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fall	Kellogg	New
Ball	Fernald	Kendrick	Newberry
Bankhead	Fletcher	Kenyon	Norris
Beckham	France	Keyes	Nugent
Borah	Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Overman
Brandegee	Gay	Knox	Owen
Capper	Gerry	La Follette	Penrose
Chamberlain	Gronna	Lenroot	Phelan
Colt	Hale	Lodge	Phlips
Culberson	Harding	McCormick	Pittman
Cummins	Harris	McCumber	Poindexter
Curtis	Harrison	McKellar	Pomerene
Dial	Henderson	McLean	Ransdell
Dillingham	Hitchcock	McNary	Robinson
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Sheppard
Elkins	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sherman



Shields	Spencer	Trammell	Warren
Simmons	Sterling	Underwood	Watson
Smith, Ga.	Swanson	Wadsworth	Williams
Smith, Md.	Thomas	Walsh, Mass.	Wolcott
Smoot	Townsend	Walsh, Mont.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee in article 40, page 61.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 61, in article 41, line 2, to strike out the words "and associated," after the word "allied."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia addressed the Senate in continuation of his previous remarks. His speech entire is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the framers of our Constitution realized the great importance and binding effect of treaties, and provided that while they can be negotiated by the President they must be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate before they can be executed. The framers of our Constitution were unwilling that the President should execute treaties, even with the approval of a majority of the Senate.

The requirement that a treaty should receive the approval of two-thirds of the Senate was intended to guarantee this country against the execution of any treaty which had not been maturely considered and overwhelmingly approved.

The peace treaty with Germany, including, as it does, the covenant of the league of nations and a provision for the international organization of labor, is the most important that has ever been submitted to the Senate. It is probably true that this treaty, in its present shape, would be more far-reaching in its effect upon the people of the United States than any measure ever acted upon by Congress.

No higher trust is confided to a Senator than that of considering and determining how he will vote upon the question of ratifying a treaty. We may make mistakes in our own internal affairs. We can not afford to make mistakes in international affairs. We must not agree to the treaty unless we are ready to carry out in perfect good faith all its obligations. If a treaty contains doubtful provisions, they should be made clear in advance of execution. If a treaty contains provisions which we do not expect our Nation in good faith to perform, we should frankly so declare before executing the treaty.

The treaty of peace with Germany contains two distinct and separate agreements. One is the treaty of peace with Germany; the other is the covenant of the league of nations, a portion of which is found after the treaty with Germany, in part 13, headed "Labor" and called "Organization of labor."

Germany, while signing the entire instrument, is not a party to the league of nations. Germany has not been admitted to the league of nations. Germany may hereafter apply for admission, but in the meantime the league covenant expressly provides for amendments to the covenant by the other nations.

The covenant of the league, agreed upon by the five principal nations associated in war against Germany, affects them alone at present, and they control it. As it affects them alone, they can make a supplemental agreement modifying and explaining provisions of the covenant without submitting it to Germany.

I am opposed to changes in the actual treaty with Germany. These, of course, could not be made without resubmission to Germany, but I am in favor of reservations clarifying the meaning of portions of the covenant and in some instances clarifying and restricting the language of the covenant, as I construe it, in its application to the United States.

I may say here that the restriction to which I refer does not in the opinion of some seem necessary as they view the meaning of the covenant, and as I would view it were the restrictions added.

I believe that substantial modifications should be placed upon part 13 of the covenant entitled "Organization of labor," but I have not undertaken to prepare them. The Senator from Colorado intends, I understand, to present such modifications and reservations, and as he has made a special study of this part of the covenant, I shall await his suggestions.

I desire to present seven reservations to the main covenant of the league. Most of these reservations have already been presented in a somewhat different form, either by the Senator from North Dakota or by the Senator from Minnesota.

One of the reservations embodies part of a reservation from the committee, and part of a reservation on the same subject by the Senator from North Dakota. Only two of the reservations are entirely my own.

It is hardly necessary to call the attention of Senators to the fact that the treaty can not be ratified in its present form. Instead of receiving the required two-thirds vote for ratification in its present form, there seems little doubt that more nearly two-thirds of the Senate are convinced it should not be so ratified, and would vote against ratification.

I desire to see the treaty ratified, but I believe reservations should be made, and call upon all Senators wishing the treaty ratified to aid in perfecting reservations, that we may ratify the treaty as soon as possible. The Senate can adopt reservations I shall submit, without affecting the treaty with Germany, any they could be accepted by cable without again requiring a reference to the Paris council.

I know it has been urged that the entire treaty and league covenant should be ratified, and amendments and corrections be made afterwards. This would be dangerous and impracticable. To amend the treaty the representatives of the nine members of the league in the council must each consent, and a majority of the members of the league whose representatives compose the assembly must consent.

This is the mode of procedure for amendment if we wait until the matter is completely organized before modifications are made.

Such an agreement would be difficult to obtain.

We should not bind this country by doubtful language or objectionable provisions, trusting to so uncertain a means of future correction. This is the time to make clear what we mean and what we are willing to do. Great Britain and France can approve, and the reservation will be passed on practically as a supplement to the covenant.

In March, 1912, soon after I entered the Senate, a peace treaty with Great Britain was under consideration. Senator Bacon, of Georgia, the ranking Democrat upon the Committee of Foreign Relations, prepared reservations to the resolution of ratification, excepting from arbitration any question "which affects the admission of aliens into the United States, or the admission of aliens to the educational institutions of the several States, or any question which depends upon or involves the maintenance of the traditional attitude of the United States concerning American questions, commonly described as the Monroe doctrine, or other purely governmental policy."

The reservations were supported by all of the Democrats, and by a large number of Republicans in the Senate.

I had the privilege of addressing the Senate at that time in support of these reservations, and of advocating cooperation between the leading nations of the world to reduce the size of standing armies, to stop the construction of battleships, and to use their influence to adjust differences that may arise between nations and settle disputes through arbitration.

I believe earnestly in the benefits which may come from such a course of action. I hope the league of nations may be an influence to prevent war. Intensely opposed to war, I wish the league every possible success toward preserving peace, but we must not forget that a majority of the white people of the world are not and may possibly never be members of the league. Nearly half of the people of the other races are not self-governing people, but are Provinces ruled by foreign countries. Under these circumstances it would be foolish to claim that the league is a guaranty against war. It may help preserve peace, but it could not be hoped that it would help if its very provisions left a certainty of dispute among its members as to what it meant.

I shall, at a later day, discuss the reservations which I present. For the present I only wish to lay them before the Senate, with the hope that they may help bring us to an agreement on reservations that may make the ratification of the treaty possible at an early date.

I have sought in part to interpret in these reservations the views of many Senators who favor ratification of the treaty and the league and favor speedy action.

I desire now to read the proposed reservations. They are as follows:

Reservations intended to be proposed by Mr. SMITH of Georgia to the pending treaty of peace with Germany, viz:

Resolved, That the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the treaty with Germany with the following provisos to be made a part of such ratification:

First. The United States understands and construes the words "dispute between members" and the words "disputes between parties," in article 15, to mean that a dispute with a principal member, self-governing dominion, colony, or dependency represented in the assembly is a dispute with the dominant or principal member represented therein, and with each of the other self-governing dominions, colonies, or dependencies thereof, and that the exclusion of the parties to the dispute provided in the last paragraph of said article will cover the dominant or principal member, its dominions, colonies, and dependencies.

Second. The United States understands that, as the covenant provides no tribunal to pass judgment upon the subject, whenever the two years' notice for withdrawal from the league of nations shall have been given by a member nation, as provided in article 1, the member nation shall be the sole judge whether all its international obligations and all its obligations under this covenant have been fulfilled, and notice of withdrawal by the United States can be given by a concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States.

Third. The United States understands that the reference to the Monroe doctrine in the league covenant means that the long-established policy of the United States, commonly known as the Monroe doctrine,



is preserved unaffected by the covenant, and that no question which depends upon or involves this policy is to be submitted to arbitration or inquiry by the assembly or the council of the league.

Fourth. The United States understands that, under the league covenant, no question can be raised either in the assembly or in the council of the league which will give either body the right to report or to make any recommendation, or to take any action upon the policy of the United States or any other member nation with regard to domestic or political questions relating to its internal affairs, including immigration, coast-wise traffic, the tariff, commerce, and all other purely domestic questions, but these questions, in whatever manner they may arise, are solely within the jurisdiction of each member nation, and are not by the covenant submitted in any way either to arbitration or to the consideration of the council or the assembly of the league of nations, or to the decision or recommendation of any other power, and, in the case of the United States, they are reserved for action by the Congress of the United States.

Fifth. The United States understands that the advice which may be given by the council or the assembly of the league with regard to the employment of the military or naval forces by a member nation, or with regard to the use of economic measures for the protection of any other country, whether member of the league or not, or for the purpose of coercing any other country or for the purpose of intervention in the internal conflicts or other controversies which may arise in any other country, is to be regarded only as advice, and leaves each member nation free to exercise its own judgment as to whether it is wise or practicable to act upon that advice, and that the Congress must determine for the United States its course.

The United States can not assume, under the provisions of article 10, or any other article, any obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country, or to interfere, under the provisions of article 16, in controversies between other nations, whether members of the league or not.

The authority for decisions in all matters, referred to in this reservation, is placed by the Constitution of the United States upon the Congress, and the failure of the Congress to adopt the suggestions of the assembly or the council of the league of nations, or to take independent action, shall not constitute a violation of the treaty, and no mandate shall be accepted by the United States, as provided in article 22, part 1, except by action of the Congress of the United States.

Sixth. The United States understands that the representatives of the other nations upon the reparations commission will interfere with exports from the United States to Germany, or from Germany to the United States, only when the United States also approves the interference.

Seventh. The United States understands that no one may represent the United States in any of the positions created by the treaty, except when appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, unless provision is hereafter made by the Congress for selections in a different manner, and the representative of the United States, either in the assembly or the council, shall have no authority to agree for the United States to any amendment to, or change in, the covenant of the league until the same has been first submitted to and ratified by the Senate of the United States, as other treaties.

Mr. President, as the subjects to which these reservations pertain are reached, I hope to have an opportunity of discussing somewhat elaborately the questions that are involved in each reservation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee in article 41, page 61.

The amendment was rejected.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is on page 77, "Government of the Territory of the Saar Basin." In subdivision 17, the last line on page 77, after the words "France or Germany" it is proposed to insert the words "or the United States of America," so that if amended, the paragraph will read:

The Governing Commission provided for by paragraph 16 shall consist of five members chosen by the Council of the League of Nations, and will include one citizen of France, one native inhabitant of the Saar Basin, not a citizen of France, and three members belonging to three countries other than France or Germany or the United States of America.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that wherever the United States was named in any of these commissions, the Senator from New Mexico moved to exclude it, and wherever it was not, he moved to include it.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the reading of this amendment, I suppose, is explanation enough to the majority of Senators. The Saar Basin matter is a very important one. The governing commission is to handle the Saar Basin for the next 15 years, and then turn it over to whomever it sees fit, irrespective of the result of a vote after that time. In other words, the league of nations, the governing commission, is not to be obligated at all by the result of a vote. Although the vote might be in favor of Germany, the commission itself, the league, exercises its discretion. The articles are very prolix and lengthy, and under the general subject cover the delivery of coal for a term of an unknown duration practically to Italy by land routes and water routes, the delivery of coal to France, the working of the mines, the governing of the people; in fact, setting up an absolute government. It is the purpose of the amendment simply to strike the United States out of the governing commission.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The purpose of the Saar Basin agreement in the treaty is to restore to France the values of which she was robbed when the Germans flooded the coal mines in northern and northwestern France. The object of the Saar Basin agreement is to give France an opportunity to keep from freezing in the winter, notwithstanding the fact that Germany vol-

untarily, deliberately, and with malice aforethought, flooded all the mines of northwestern France. There is no particular reason why the representative of any Government except France should have anything to do with this particular question, except that at the end of the period fixed the league of nations is to take jurisdiction; and the league of nations, in fact, does take jurisdiction even before that.

Mr. President, the most wonderful piece of deliberate atrocity ever committed in the world, almost, except atrocities where men, women, and children were slaughtered, was committed by Germany when she was retreating from the coal basin of France, and deliberately flooded the mines and deprived capital of all opportunity for dividends and labor of all opportunity for wages. When the council sitting upon this question came to it, they concluded that France had the right of reparation for that act, and the President of the United States, when it was going on, took the trouble of making himself a voluntary interferer in European affairs, as some Senators might express it, sending a message to the German Army, which Ludendorff, in his memoirs published in this morning's paper, mentions, saying that that sort of thing must stop or the allied and associated powers would demand full reparation in money for it. That is all. Any man who wants to quarrel with France about having her coal furnished her for a limited number of years, long enough to enable her to get her own mines back into working order—that is how they arrived at the period—is perfectly willing to have Germany freeze the French people to death in the winter time without one word said by all the people who fought with France and against Germany.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is almost universally understood, by those who have not had an opportunity to read the treaty and examine it in detail, that the Saar Valley provisions of the treaty provide that at the end of 15 years that territory shall be returned or shall be joined to whatever nationality or nation the people shall decide they wish to have it under. In other words, if they vote that it shall be returned to Germany, it will go to Germany; or, if they vote to ally themselves with France, the supposition is that it will go to France.

But these are not the terms or conditions of the treaty at all. The vote is at most advisory. The great objections I have to the Saar Valley proposition are, first, that it engages the United States practically to take part in a supergovernment over the Saar Valley, and, secondly, the plebiscite is really of no force or effect at all. The league of nations may determine it as they see fit, regardless of how the vote may be cast. It says that the league of nations shall decide on the sovereignty under which the territory is to be placed, taking into account the wishes of the inhabitants as expressed by the voting. In other words, the vote is simply advisory. If one will examine the terms of the treaty and then take into consideration who will constitute the council or the control of the assembly, there will be no difficulty in determining where the Saar Valley will inevitably land.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, with the other reason which I have just stated, that it necessitates the Government of the United States taking part in a governmental affair in Europe for an interminable length of time, that I shall vote in favor of the amendment. If the provisions of the treaty were such as to accomplish nothing more than that which has been suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], there could be no objection to it. No one would object to France being properly repaid for any damages which had been done during the late war, but they do not stop with that proposition at all, and it is when they get beyond that that I object to it, and therefore I shall vote for the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi has already spoken once, and under the agreement no one is permitted to speak more than once.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not speak five minutes. I am entitled to speak at least five minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator, however, can not now consume the time he omitted before.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho in summary has expressed the opinion of many of us, but before Senators vote on this amendment I wish to recall to the Senate the secret agreement between the Imperial Russian Government and the French Government, if my memory does not fail me, during the presidency of the council of ministers of Monsieur Briand, which stipulated, in brief, that Russia should draw her western frontier where she saw fit and that France should annex Alsace and Lorraine and the Saar Basin. It stipulated further, that a neutral State should be constituted west of the Rhine. This provision, as I think may be very



easily demonstrated, is in fulfillment of that project, as the plan for the occupation of the territory west of the Rhine is in partial fulfillment of that project. If Senators doubt that statement, they may find evidence in support of it not only in the treaty, but in the debates in the French Chamber of Deputies, in which I have taken the pains to study for French opinion of the treaty. Sections in the treaty provide that the Saar Basin shall be economically united to France, that its currency shall be French, that the tariff customs shall be French; in short, that before they vote the inhabitants shall be bound to France by every economic tie. Monsieur Maurice, in the French Chamber, predicated part of his speech upon the assumption that, of course, the inhabitants of the Saar would vote to unite to France at the end of the period of occupation.

In order that the unsupported opinion of the partisans on this side of the Chamber may not stand alone, I venture to read in part the comment of the great New York World, the organ of his excellency the President and his administration:

Nothing at all has been said in the Senate about the Saar Valley arrangement, yet in comparison the Shantung provision is an act of diplomatic philanthropy. Theoretically, the Saar Valley arrangement was made to compensate France for the wanton destruction of the coal mines in the Lens district; but the French representatives were not satisfied with obtaining ton for ton of coal, or with operating the Saar mines until the Lens district could be rehabilitated. They demanded the Saar Valley itself by way of reparation, with its 500,000 German inhabitants.

President Wilson forced a compromise under which the French are to have the mines and the coal outright, the Saar Valley is to be governed by the league of nations, the question of ultimate nationality is to be left to a plebiscite at the end of 15 years, and the Germans are to have the privilege of buying back the mines with gold, provided the reparations commission leaves them any funds with which to make the purchase.

There is no more dishonest provision in the whole treaty than this for the Saar Basin. If it had been provided that the territory should be annexed outright to France; that the German inhabitants should be indemnified for their property, so they might go to Germany, that would have been an open act of annexation; that would have been candid; that could be defended. But it is not defensible to provide for annexation, disguised and glossed over by the dishonest terms of the text of the treaty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the idea has been advanced that inasmuch as Germany is not a member of the league of nations and for some time to come is not to be a member, amendments may be proposed by the Senate or reservations may be annexed without the necessity to obtain the assent of Germany to such amendments or reservations. I submitted some remarks upon this subject some days ago, and at that time promised to put in the Record a reference to those parts of the treaty conferring power upon the league of nations of very vital interest to Germany.

Time will not permit, under the rule under which we are now operating, to put in the entire list, but I desire to invite the attention of the Senate at this time to provisions conferring power upon the league of nations, or the council of the league, so far as the Saar Basin is concerned.

Article 48, page 67, of the treaty provides that—

A commission composed of five members, one appointed by France, one by Germany, and three by the council of the league of nations, which will select nationals of other powers, will be constituted within 15 days from the coming into force of the present treaty to trace on the spot the frontier line described above.

This commission, appointed by the council of the league of nations, defines boundaries of the Saar Basin, which is temporarily to be turned over to the league of nations as a part of the territory of Germany.

Article 49. Germany renounces in favor of the league of nations, in the capacity of trustee, the government of the territory defined above.

Accordingly, Germany is vitally concerned in the constitution of the league of nations and, of course, in the important body, the council.

At page 77, sections 16 and 17 of the annex to article 49, I read as follows:

The government of the territory of the Saar Basin shall be intrusted to a commission representing the league of nations. This commission shall sit in the territory of the Saar Basin.

Section 17 reads:

The governing commission provided for by paragraph 16 shall consist of five members chosen by the council of the league of nations, and will include one citizen of France, one native inhabitant of the Saar Basin, not a citizen of France, and three members belonging to three countries other than France or Germany.

And then:

The members of the governing commission shall be appointed for one year and may be reappointed. They can be removed by the council of the league of nations, which will provide for their replacement.

The members of the governing commission will be entitled to a salary which will be fixed by the council of the league of nations and charged on the local revenues.

Then section 18 provides that—

The chairman of the governing commission shall be appointed for one year from among the members of the commission by the council of the league of nations and may be reappointed.

That is to say, the league of nations not only appoints the commission but elects the chairman of the commission.

Section 34 of the annex concerns the plebiscite. After the Saar Basin is thus governed by the commission appointed by the league of nations for 15 years a plebiscite is to be taken which shall determine the future of that important territory. A vote is to be taken, and section 34 provides that—

All persons, without distinction of sex, more than 20 years old at the date of the voting, resident in the territory at the date of the signature of the present treaty, will have the right to vote.

Then—

The other conditions, methods, and the date of the voting shall be fixed by the council of the league of nations in such a way as to secure the freedom, secrecy, and trustworthiness of the voting.

That is to say, all the machinery, practically all the laws, under which the election is to be conducted, will be prescribed by the council of the league of nations.

Then after the vote is taken it is canvassed by the league of nations and a determination as to the future of that territory is made by the council in accordance with the provisions of section 35, as follows:

The league of nations shall decide on the sovereignty under which the territory is to be placed, taking into account the wishes of the inhabitants as expressed by the voting:

(a) If, for the whole or part of the territory, the league of nations decides in favor of the maintenance of the régime established by the present treaty and this annex, Germany hereby agrees to make such renunciation of her sovereignty in favor of the league of nations as the latter shall deem necessary. It will be the duty of the league of nations to take appropriate steps to adapt the régime definitively adopted to the permanent welfare of the territory and the general interest;

(b) If, for the whole or part of the territory, the league of nations decides in favor of union with France, Germany hereby agrees to cede to France in accordance with the decision of the league of nations all rights and title over the territory specified by the league;

(c) If, for the whole or part of the territory, the league of nations decides in favor of union with Germany, it will be the duty of the league of nations to cause the German Government to be reestablished in the government of the territory specified by the league.

Then section 36 reads:

If the league of nations decides in favor of the union of the whole or part of the territory of the Saar Basin with Germany, France's rights of ownership in the mines situated in such part of the territory will be repurchased by Germany in their entirety at a price payable in gold.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, just a word in reply to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. Under this treaty the league of nations is constituted by the representatives of those countries which have ratified the treaty and of such countries as shall accept the invitation to join. Therefore, when France, Japan, and England have ratified this treaty, the league of nations, I take it, comes into being. If that be not so, there can be no league of nations at all, because China has refused to ratify or become a party to it. Then, if that be true, when our deposit of ratification takes place those members who have then ratified the treaty constitute the league of nations, and they can amend the league of nations covenant in any way they see fit. If they unanimously agree that these amendments shall be adopted, then, of course, they become effective without the action of Germany.

I wish, however, to say a word, Mr. President, upon the pending amendment. I am wholly in sympathy with the criticisms which have been made concerning the provisions of this treaty relative to the Saar Basin. I think it is a sham in so far as any plebiscite or any right of self-determination is concerned; but the pending amendment does not in the least degree affect that question. If this amendment be adopted, all the evils of this part of the treaty will still remain. The final sovereignty of the Saar Basin, under this treaty, will not be determined by this commission, whether the United States be a member of it or not. That sovereignty, under the provisions of the treaty, will be determined by the league of nations. This amendment has nothing whatever to do with it. All that the amendment would do, if adopted, would be to render the United States ineligible to become a member of the commission for the government of the Saar Basin pending its final disposition.

We need adopt no amendment, Mr. President, to insure that the United States can not become a member of this commission without its consent. By reservation we can and, I hope, will provide that the United States shall accept membership upon no commission under this treaty unless Congress itself shall authorize such acceptance, so that, in so far as this commission is concerned, the United States can protect itself to the fullest extent without any amendment of the treaty. I am, therefore, opposed to the amendment.



Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, after the armistice was concluded the President appeared before Congress and declared that the objects for which we entered the war had been accomplished. Shortly afterwards the Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably Senate resolution 76. That resolution had been prepared and introduced by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox], and it provided as follows:

Mr. BRANDEGEE proceeded to read the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask that the remainder of the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution entire is as follows:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States in declaring, pursuant to its exclusive authority under the Constitution, the existence of a state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government, solemnly affirmed that the Imperial Government has so 'committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States' that a state of war had been thrust upon them by that Government, and thereupon formally pledged the whole military and national resources of the country 'to bring the conflict to a successful termination'; and

"Whereas the Senate of the United States, being a coequal part of the treaty-making power of this Government, and therefore coequally responsible for any treaty which is concluded and ratified, is deeply concerned over the draft treaty of peace negotiated at Versailles by which it is proposed to end our victorious war and is gravely impressed by the fact that its provisions appear calculated to force upon us undesirable and far-reaching covenants inimical to our free institutions under the penalty that failing to accept these we shall continue in a state of war while our cobelligerents shall be at peace and enjoying its blessings; that it is proposed to make us parties to a league of nations, under a plan as to which the people of the United States have had neither time to examine and consider nor opportunity to express regarding it a matured and deliberate judgment, whereas the treaty may be easily so drawn as to permit the making of immediate peace, leaving the question of the establishment of a league of nations for later determination; and that the treaty as drawn contains principles, guaranties, and undertakings obliterative of legitimate race and national aspirations, oppressive of weak nations and peoples, and destructive of human progress and liberty: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the United States will regard as fully adequate for our national needs and as completely responsive to the duties and obligations we owe to our cobelligerents and to humanity, a peace treaty which shall assure to the United States and its people the attainment of those ends for which we entered the war, and that it will look with disfavor upon all treaty provisions going beyond these ends.

"2. That since the people of the United States have themselves determined and provided in their Constitution the only ways in which the Constitution may be amended, and since amendment by treaty stipulation is not one of the methods which the people have so prescribed, the treaty-making power of the United States has no authority to make a treaty which in effect amends the Constitution of the United States, and the Senate of the United States can not advise and consent to any treaty provision which would have such effect, if enforced.

"3. That the Senate advises, in accordance with its constitutional right and duty, that the great paramount, if not sole duty, of the peace conference is quickly to bring all the belligerents a full and complete peace; that to this end the treaty shall be so drawn as to permit any nation to reserve without prejudice to itself for future separate and full consideration by its people the question of any league of nations, that neither such an article nor the exercise of the rights reserved thereunder, whether at the time of signature, the time of ratification, or at any other time, shall affect the substance of the obligations of Germany and its cobelligerents under the treaty, nor the validity of signature and ratification on their behalf; and that any indispensable participation by the United States in matters covered by the league covenant shall, pending the entry of the United States into the league, be accomplished through diplomatic commissions which shall be created with full power in the premises.

"4. That this resolution indicates and gives notice of the limits of the present obligations against the United States in which the Senate of the United States is now prepared to acquiesce by consenting to the ratification of a treaty embodying peace conditions that may be found otherwise acceptable to its

judgment, and that the adoption by the peace conference of the foregoing reasonable limitations and positions will facilitate the early acceptance of the treaty of peace by the Senate of the United States, will in no wise interfere with the league of nations as between these countries prepared to ratify the treaty without further consideration and will afford such a manifestation of real respect for the wishes of a great people as can not fall more firmly to cement the friendship already existing between ourselves and our cobelligerents.

"5. That, finally, it shall be the declared policy of our Government, in order to meet fully and fairly our obligations to ourselves and to the world, that the freedom and peace of Europe being again threatened by any power or combination of powers, the United States will regard such a situation with grave concern as a menace to its own peace and freedom, will consult with other powers affected with a view to devising means for the removal of such menace, and will, the necessity arising in the future, carry out the same complete accord and cooperation with our chief cobelligerents for the defense of civilization."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have not said much in reference to the ratification of the treaty of peace, but I think this amendment goes to the very vitals of the situation. Lest we forget, I wish to remind Senators that France was our ally in the war with Germany. I think we should make a just peace, and we should see that justice is done our ally; but we might as well strike out of the treaty of peace the word "justice" if we propose by our action to countenance the efforts of the German Army to freeze to death the people of France. It was only a year ago that the commander of the German armies ordered the French mines flooded with water; not to stop the French Army, but, if possible, to make the French people freeze during the winter of 1918-19. Now the time has come to balance the books and do justice; and, to my mind, even and exact justice requires the people of Germany and the German nation to pay the bill as the bill is rendered.

So far as I am concerned, I feel willing to turn the Saar Basin and its coal mines over to France permanently to pay this bill; but it is left to the future to determine what shall be the result after 15 years. For 15 years, however, the coal mines of the Saar Valley are to supply the people of France in place of the French coal mines which a year ago were destroyed deliberately, without necessity, and without cause by the German armies.

What will be the effect of this amendment? It will not affect the ultimate result, because, even if we refuse to be represented on this commission and the treaty is ratified, the commission will be there, and, thank God, justice will be done to the French people. But if we vote for the pending amendment, we say that we will not be represented on this commission, and what will be the conclusion that our allies must draw? It will be that we do not approve of the justice of this treaty; that we do not approve of the proposition that the Germans must pay in full for the fuel which they took from the nation that a year ago was struggling to maintain the battle for humanity and the rights and liberty of the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama pardon an interruption with a view of reinforcing what he has just said?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A few moments ago some Senator—one, at any rate, and, I think, two—said that we are turning over the Saar Basin everlastingly and indefinitely to France. Now, I wish to call attention not only to the English but to the French of this treaty. If the Senate will read Chapter III, under the head of "Plebiscite," and the same language under the head of "Consultation Populaire," which means "popular consultation," they will find this language, which is clearer in the French of the treaty than it is even in the English:

At the termination of a period of 15 years from the coming into force of the present treaty, the population of the territory of the Saar Basin will be called upon to indicate their desires in the following manner:

A vote will take place by communes or districts on the three following alternatives:

I will say that it was determined that the vote should take place by communes or districts, because it was thought that perhaps the population closest to the Rhine might want to vote to go with Germany; that the population closest to Lorraine might want to go with Lorraine, and perhaps the central population might want to be an independent country. I will read what the article says—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sure, Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has reinforced my statement.



Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not want to ask unanimous consent for anything, because it might delay something here. I will go on. Later on I will then bring what I want in, and I will prove beyond all peradventure and challenge that all the statements about definite and ultimate French sovereignty in the Saar Basin are absolutely false.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think attention might well be called to paragraph or subdivision 19, which will be found on page 79; it has not as yet been read into the RECORD by any of the Senators who have discussed this amendment, so, as a brief introductory to my own remarks, I desire to read it:

Within the territory of the Saar Basin the governing commission shall have all the powers of government hitherto belonging to the German Empire, Prussia, or Bavaria, including the appointment and dismissal of officials and the creation of such administrative and representative bodies as it may deem necessary.

It shall have full powers to administer and operate the railways, canals, and the different public services.

Its decisions shall be taken by a majority.

Mr. President, an examination of that language reveals the fact, of course, that the powers vested in this governing commission are practically without limit. There is no constitutional provision that I know of contained in this part of the treaty, or in any other part of the document, which places any restraint upon the governing commission which is to rule the Saar Basin for 15 years. I make no criticism of that; but I do believe that we should give pause to our haste and determine whether it is an entirely healthy thing for the Government of the United States—for that is what this amounts to—to endeavor to govern or take a principal share in the government of a European community for a period of 15 years.

Mr. President, "government is politics" and politics is government."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. BORAH. It might be for an indefinite period, might it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Indeed it might, as I read the language; but I do not pretend to guess what the future will bring forth under this treaty, particularly this portion of it referring to the Saar Basin.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has plead for France, and the compensation to be given to France for the loss of her coal. So, also, has the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I make no objection whatsoever against the contention that the French people should be compensated for the terrific losses they suffered in the destruction of their coal mines in the Lens area. I make no criticism of this treaty on that ground. I hope they do get compensation; I hope the German people are made to pay; but I am not convinced that that depends upon the United States taking part in the government of a European community for 15 years.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. FALL. Of course, this plea for France is very touching, and, as the Senator says, we all agree to it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Absolutely.

Mr. FALL. At the same time, this very treaty takes away from Germany, aside from the Saar Basin coal fields, all the East Prussian coal fields and the Upper Silesian coal fields, and turns them over to other nations.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, it is true that there are other provisions in this treaty affecting reparations or compensations in the matter of coal. I think, under other provisions of the treaty, Germany must deliver so many million tons of coal per year to other nations for a limited number of years.

However, as I said before, I am not criticizing the proposal that France should be compensated. I may be charged with being old-fashioned, Mr. President, but I doubt the ability of the people and Government of the United States successfully to interfere with and manage the politics of Europe. This government of the Saar Basin is going to become a political problem. I think the Europeans are competent to solve it themselves. I entertain the suspicion that our interference in some of these things has been gratuitous upon our part and not by their invitation. If I thought that our services in this regard were absolutely vital and essential in securing to France compensation for the destruction or injury of the Lens area coal mines, I would say, "Yes; I will accept that burden for the United

States"; but I do not believe it is essential. I doubt if there are many people who do believe it is essential. This article seems to be a part of the scheme, a part of this new philosophy which teaches or attempts to teach the American people that for indefinite periods of time they shall take part in the political concerns of Europe; and I am opposed to that philosophy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if anything should develop in the future so that it would be necessary for the United States to be on this commission, this amendment excludes her absolutely, if it is adopted, from ever being permitted to be a member of the commission, because if this amendment is adopted it becomes a part of this treaty, and we have agreed to the exclusion of the United States.

There are a great many parts of this treaty that are left to commissions, and that are as absolutely necessary to be administered, because they are executory and as important as the treaty itself. All that this does is to leave it to the council, on which the United States will have a member, to determine which ones of the disinterested parties shall administer the Saar Basin and be on the commission. If the United States does not want to be on that commission, it has a member on the council, and the decision must be by a unanimous vote of the council, as I understand. Does this provide that the question shall be determined by a majority vote of the council unless otherwise provided?

Mr. FALL. The council has nothing to do with it, has it?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; the council of the league of nations.

Mr. FALL. Very well. In the matter of all committees it is distinctly provided that the council goes by majority.

Mr. SWANSON. The council of the league of nations. Now, the United States is certainly under some obligation to the signatories to this treaty, if it makes the treaty, if it is a party to it, and makes promises that certain things shall and will be done, to see that they are done; and I can not see why the United States should be prohibited under all circumstances, and for all time to come, from being a party to seeing that this treaty is properly executed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia pardon me just a moment?

Mr. SWANSON. I will in a minute. The paragraph reads as follows:

The governing commission provided for by paragraph 16 shall consist of five members chosen by the council of the league of nations and will include one citizen of France, one native inhabitant of the Saar Basin not a citizen of France, and three members belonging to three countries other than France or Germany.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And if the Senator will pursue it a little further—

Mr. SWANSON. Now, if this is added, it will read "or the United States of America." I have but five minutes, and the Senator can take his own time. Consequently if that is added we are excluded as much as France and Germany, and if things should develop in the future so that we wanted to be a member of that commission and it was necessary for the peace of the world, we are prohibited. I think that even if it would be wise to amend the treaty it would be unwise to amend it in this respect. I think to amend this treaty means sending it back to the peace conference to be negotiated again, which means long delay, and nobody can tell what would come out of the peace conference if it were sent back. Consequently I am opposed to all these amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. FALL. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and vote "nay."

Mr. DIAL (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). I desire to announce that the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is detained from the Senate on account of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], which I will ask to have transferred to the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. If my colleague were here, he would vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). The junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] has announced the transfer of the pair of the senior Senator from South Carolina



[Mr. SMITH] to the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. That leaves me free to vote, and I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN] is detained from the city on account of illness. He has a pair with the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. If my colleague were present and could vote, he would vote "nay." I desire that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 56, as follows:

#### YEAS—31.

Ball	Fernald	Lodge	Phipps
Borah	France	McCormick	Polindexter
Brandegge	Frelinghuysen	McLean	Sherman
Calder	Gronna	Moses	Thomas
Curtis	Harding	New	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Warren
Elkins	Knox	Norris	Watson
Fall	La Follette	Penrose	

#### NAYS—56.

Ashurst	Harris	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Harrison	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Henderson	Nugent	Smoot
Capper	Hitchcock	Overman	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Stanley
Colt	Kellogg	Phelan	Sterling
Culberson	Kendrick	Pittman	Swanson
Cummins	Kenyon	Pomerene	Townsend
Dial	Keyes	Ransdell	Trammell
Edge	Kirby	Robinson	Underwood
Fletcher	Lenroot	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Gay	McCumber	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	McKellar	Simmons	Williams
Hale	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott

#### NOT VOTING—9.

Gore	King	Page	Smith, S. C.
Johnson, Calif.	Martin	Reed	Sutherland
Johnson, S. Dak.			

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say that when the bell rang for the vote which was just taken on the Saar Valley amendment I made haste to reach the Chamber. I reached the Chamber just a moment too late to vote on that call. I desired to vote for the Saar Valley amendment. I was under the impression, when the previous vote was taken this afternoon, that that particular amendment was involved in the vote. I understood that a number of amendments were being voted on en bloc at that time, as has just been done. I learned afterwards of my misapprehension. This misapprehension was due to the fact that I have not been able to be in constant attendance in the Senate.

Mr. President, I merely add that I hesitate to obligate ourselves or to have the United States assume an obligation to send our boys to the Saar Valley or elsewhere to do police duty for the next 15 or 20 years to come.

I desire, as far as possible and as fast as possible, to have the United States withdraw from European politics and European quarrels. If they desire to try the experiment, I see no reason at this time why Great Britain, France, Italy, and the other European allies should not establish a Monroe doctrine with respect to Europe as the United States has established the Monroe doctrine with respect to the Americas. My only purpose is to diminish the dangers and possibilities of war and multiply and strengthen the guaranties of peace.

I should like to have this statement follow the roll call, if there is no objection.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment of the committee is, on page 103, in article 65, after the word "allied" to strike out the words "and associated."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I was calling attention to those provisions of the treaty giving the league of nations powers over the Saar Basin. We have come to the plebiscite, section 36. It reads:

If the league of nations decides in favor of the union of the whole or part of the territory of the Saar Basin with Germany, France's rights of ownership in the mines situated in such part of the territory will be repurchased by Germany in their entirety at a price payable in gold.

37.

If, in consequence of the repurchase provided for in paragraph 36, the ownership of the mines or any part of them is transferred to Germany, the French State and French nationals shall have the right to purchase such amount of coal of the Saar Basin as their industrial and domestic needs are found at that time to require. An equitable arrangement regarding amounts of coal, duration of contract, and prices will be fixed in due time by the council of the league of nations.

38.

It is understood that France and Germany may, by special agreements concluded before the time fixed for the payment of the price for the repurchase of the mines, modify the provisions of paragraphs 36 and 37.

39.

The council of the league of nations shall make such provisions as may be necessary for the establishment of the régime which is to take effect after the decisions of the league of nations mentioned in paragraph 35 have become operative, including an equitable apportionment of any obligations of the Government of the territory of the Saar Basin arising from loans raised by the commission or from other causes.

From the coming into force of the new régime, the powers of the governing commission will terminate, except in the case provided for in paragraph 35 (a).

40.

In all matters dealt with in the present annex, the decisions of the council of the league of nations will be taken by a majority.

In view of these provisions, which I will supplement later by other provisions, I can not understand how it can be asserted that Germany, even though she is not a member of the league, is not vitally concerned in every provision of the treaty in relation to the league of nations.

Just a word further on another subject, Mr. President. I was deeply interested in the criticisms of the provision of the treaty now under consideration, because when that particular part of the treaty was under consideration at the conference at Versailles I listened to the most terrific arraignment of the President of the United States because he endeavored in the negotiations to temper in some degree the demands of France with reference to that particular territory. It was rather vulgarly but emphatically expressed by the gentleman who was conversing with me by saying, "What business has the President of the United States to stick his nose into that business?" Now the complaint is made that he was not able to succeed as well as he ought to have succeeded in reference to this feature of the treaty. In other words, he was condemned because he tried to temper them, and now he is condemned because they were too severe.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, before the last vote was taken I attempted to gain a hearing. I was following House rules; and I thought that if one had five minutes to talk, and took two minutes at one time, he could have the remaining three later on. The Chair ruled against me, and I think the Chair was right, under the wording of the rule.

So many misunderstandings, or misinterpretations, or misrepresentations, whichever they may be, have taken place in connection with the Saar Basin provision in the treaty, that I want to put in the RECORD just the bare words of the treaty itself. That is all I want. This is what it says under the head of "Plebiscite," chapter 3, page 87:

At the termination of a period of 15 years from the coming into force of the present treaty, the population of the territory of the Saar Basin will be called upon to indicate their desires in the following manner:

A vote will take place by communes or districts on the three following alternatives.

I want to call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that it is not only the vote of the entire country, but a vote by districts and communes, so that if there be communes up close to Lorraine that want to go to France, and communes down by the Rhine that want to go to Germany, and communes in the center that want to be independent, each one can express its own opinion and have its destiny determined by itself. This continues:

A vote will take place by communes or districts on the three following alternatives: (a) Maintenance of the régime established by the present treaty and by this annex; (b) union with France; (c) union with Germany.

Gentlemen are quarreling because our ally, France, got too much out of this. If I have any quarrel with it, it is because Germany is getting too much.

The Senator from New Mexico has just denied that the council had anything to do with it. Those are the plain words of the treaty. I continue the reading:

All persons without distinction of sex, more than 20 years old at the date of the voting, resident in the territory at the date of signature of the present treaty, will have the right to vote.

The other conditions, methods, and the date of the voting shall be fixed by the council of the league of nations in such a way as to secure the freedom, secrecy, and trustworthiness of the voting.

Even the female inhabitants of the district and the communes can vote.

I continue reading article 35:

The league of nations shall decide upon the sovereignty under which the territory is to be placed, taking into account the wishes of the inhabitants as expressed by the voting.

I remember that in committee the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] had some doubt about the meaning of that, but after my explaining it he agreed with me. Then the treaty provides (a), (b), and (c), part of it is to remain as it is, if so determined; part of it is to go to France, if so determined



by vote; and a part or all to Germany, if so determined, and I will read (c).

If for the whole or part of the territory the league of nations decides in favor of union with Germany—

After taking into account the wishes of the inhabitants, as expressed by the voting of the people, males and females over 20 years of age voting—

It will be the duty of the league of nations to cause the German Government to be reestablished in the government of the territory specified by the league.

That is more than anybody ever did in a forced treaty for an enemy since the world began. This treaty differs from all other treaties in that respect; it carries justice even to the enemy. I continue to read:

36.

If the league of nations decides in favor of the union of the whole or part of the territory of the Saar Basin with Germany, France's rights of ownership in the mines situated in such part of the territory will be repurchased by Germany in their entirety at a price payable in gold. The price to be paid will be fixed by three experts, one nominated by Germany, one by France, and one, who shall be neither a Frenchman nor a German, by the council of the league of nations; the decision of the experts will be given by a majority.

How could anybody have made innocently such a misrepresentation as to what these provisions plainly contain after reading the plain language?

Mr. BORAH. I send to the desk, Mr. President, a letter, and ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.  
Washington, October 1, 1919.

DEAR SENATOR: In its issue of September 30, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD publishes a speech made by you in that body on September 29, from which I take the following extract:

"Sir, it is reported that upon the 26th day of February, 1919, the Secretary of the Navy declared before the Press Club in Washington: 'The constitution of the league of nations will be remembered long after the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are forgotten.'"

I never made such a statement at the Press Club in Washington or anywhere else. I do not entertain such opinion and never gave expression to such a view. Inasmuch as you have been misled by an incorrect report, for you say "it is reported," I am sure you will wish to have this denial printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of simple justice.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am very glad, of course, to have the letter inserted in the RECORD. I desire to say, however, in justification of the statement which I made, that the evidence seems to be ample that there was a complete misunderstanding upon the part of those who were present that night as to what the Secretary said, if the Secretary is now correct in his memory. I have before me, Mr. President, a copy of the special dispatch from Washington to the New York Times of February 25, 1919, which reads as follows:

[New York Times, Feb. 26, 1919, Washington dispatch of Feb. 25, 1919.]

In a speech at the National Press Club to-night Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, only a few hours after he had attended a Cabinet meeting, said that President Wilson had returned from Europe bringing with him the first draft of a document—the charter of the proposed league of nations—which would live longer than the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, because the league of nations, he added, "means for the whole world what these documents have meant for America."

Since the Secretary sent me the letter I have conversed with several parties who were present at the meeting that night, and they all understood the speech of the Secretary to be as I have quoted it.

I also have a letter addressed to me by a business man in Washington, under date of February 26, 1919, whose business place is in the Munsey Building. I do not put his name in the RECORD because I have not been able to get in touch with him to obtain his consent, but I feel free to furnish it to the Secretary of the Navy in a confidential way. His letter is as follows:

Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BORAH: At the National Press Club last evening, Secretary Josephus Daniels made a speech in which he included an appeal for support for the league of nations. He came to the club fresh from his attendance at the Cabinet meeting at the White House, where, presumably, he had been duly inspired by the atmosphere of "internationalism" which prevails there. In his speech Secretary Daniels said:

"The constitution of the league of nations will be remembered long after the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution are forgotten."

I do not know of any statement which has been made, of equal brevity, which so well sustains the position which you have taken on this vital matter.

You can secure confirmation of the above from any of those who were present at the club last evening. For your further information, I would say that the Secretary was speaking at that moment along the

lines of the statement in the President's recent speech about the isolation which would be the lot of those who opposed the league of nations. The Secretary spoke of the oblivion suffered by those who opposed the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. Then, in an outburst of eloquence, he uttered the sentence which I have quoted literally above.

Confidentially, yours,

The letter is signed by the individual whose name, I say, I do not give for the reason that I have not perhaps the right, although I will assume the right to give it to the Secretary for his personal use in case he desires to see it.

I desire to say, too, in further justification of my statement, that I believe that the Secretary of the Navy will find that this quotation was carried by the press generally throughout the country. I saw it in several newspapers, and did not suppose there was any doubt as to the correctness of the statement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] whether it will be possible to secure unanimous consent for the consideration of some of these amendments en bloc. I will state that I have been discussing the matter with him to some extent and I think it may be possible to reach some agreement which will greatly shorten this proceeding.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I will say frankly that I have no desire for a ye-and-nay vote upon the various amendments which are pending, and am satisfied that the vote might as well be taken en bloc, though possibly it might be well to state what the amendments are.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will read the numbers slowly so that the Secretary can take them down: Nos. 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38.

Mr. FALL. It will be very satisfactory to me to have a viva voce vote taken on these amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask a question for information. Are the amendments that have just been designated those in which the words "and associated" are stricken out?

Mr. FALL. Yes; they are the amendments in which those words are asked to be stricken out, but they are not all the amendments in which the words "and associated" appear.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are a part of those?

Mr. FALL. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I inquire what amendments that would leave undisposed of of the Fall amendments?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That would leave undisposed of Nos. 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 23, and 45, and on some of those the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] desires a ye-and-nay vote.

Mr. FALL. On at least one of them I would ask a ye-and-nay vote, but as to the desire of other Senators, of course, I can not speak.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments, the numbers of which I have read from 7 to 38, may be considered en bloc and that a vote be taken on them viva voce.

Mr. FALL. I suppose it is satisfactory to the Senate to vote on them by number without knowing what they are.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked that the amendments which were designated by the Senator from Nebraska may be voted on en bloc and disposed of by a viva voce vote.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. President, I only want to be perfectly clear that one of the amendments, touching the provisions dealing with the Polish or Czecho-Slovak treaty, relative to the rights of linguistic and racial minorities, shall be reserved for a roll call.

Mr. FALL. Neither of those amendments, I will say to the Senator from Illinois, is included in the list indicated by the Senator from Nebraska. The amendments referring to the Czecho-Slovak treaty and the Polish treaty are Nos. 9 and 16, respectively.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I ask if they refer to the amendment on page 129, under paragraph numbered 2 of the annex, with reference to plebiscite, area, and international government? I have not the treaty before me showing the numbers, and that is the reason why I make the inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary advises the Chair that the amendment suggested by the Senator from Washington is excepted and will be voted on separately.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the agreement proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered. The question is upon agreeing to the amendments named by the Senator from Nebraska, voting on them en bloc.

The amendments were rejected.



The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The SECRETARY. On page 123, amendment No. 9, in article 86. The article reads:

The Czecho-Slovak State accepts and agrees to embody in a treaty with the principal allied and associated powers, etc.

After the word "allied," in line 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "and associated."

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, this article is one of those touching the constitution of the Czecho-Slovak State which is being created or organized from territory belonging to several other powers. The inhabitants, of course, represent various races and as many languages and as many religions. It is proposed in the treaty with Germany, to which the Czecho-Slovak State is made a party, that a treaty shall hereafter be made between the principal allied and associated powers by the terms of which Czechoslovakia shall agree "to protect the interests of inhabitants of that State who differ from the majority of the population in race, language or religion."

Czechoslovakia, of course, may be compelled to accept this provision. Poland may be compelled to accept a similar provision under article 93. Amendment No. 16 refers to a similar proposition concerning Poland. At least one of the Allies, Roumania, who took a portion of the territory which is now taken by force of arms or by agreement of written word, to which the United States signs its name, has refused to adopt a similar provision in a treaty submitted to her. Roumania has insisted that if such provision should be written into the constitution of nations or in the treaties between them, it should be a general provision.

Roumania has distinctly stated that she would not submit to have the principal allied and associated powers force upon her a treaty of this kind when they themselves did not adopt similar provisions. Some of her great statesmen have instanced the fact that in the United States of America we have various races and religions. Some of them have referred to the fact that we have some 13,000,000 citizens of African descent in this country, and some of the statesmen of these foreign countries have insisted that before these smaller nations should be compelled by the power of the allied and associated nations to agree to a provision of this kind the five allied and associated nations should obligate themselves to a similar provision and set the example.

As I have said, one at least of our gallant allies, who suffered as much as any country has possibly suffered during this great war, Roumania, has refused to agree to such a provision in the treaty proposed with her. I do not believe that it is the business of the United States of America, nor do I believe the people will ever consent to make it their business in the event of a violation of the terms of the proposed treaty containing these provisions, made under force of arms or under duress or under bribery by Czechoslovakia or by Poland, nor will the people of the United States ever allow their Congress, if it becomes a question of the permission of Congress, to draft their men and send them across the borders to protect the racial minority or those of different language or different religion within the Czecho-Slovak State.

I believe it is useless, I believe it is futile, and I most thoroughly sympathize with the objection made by these smaller nations that if the principal allied and associated powers, the United States of America being one, compel them to adopt these provisions, they should themselves adopt them. For these reasons I moved in committee to strike out the words "and associated"—that is, the United States—from the provisions of this article, and the committee adopted the amendment.

Mr. President, there is another motive which influences me. The demands that are now made by Roumania will be made just so surely as you ever constitute a council of the league of nations or an assembly of the league of nations; and aligned then against the United States, for the purpose of compelling the United States to adopt a similar provision in our Constitution and in our laws, you will find the colored nations of the earth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I concede that there is a slight difference between the case of Roumania and either Poland or Czechoslovakia. Roumania existed as an independent nation prior to the time when this treaty was negotiated. We are constituting these new nations; and I desire to inquire of the Senator from New Mexico—he may answer the question in my time—whether or not he would like to see this arrangement entered into between these new and yet unstable countries and any of the nations of Europe; in other words, whether he would like to see any kind of a guaranty that these new and

unstable countries will accord religious freedom, for instance, to all the people within their boundaries? If the Senator would like to see some guaranty of that kind as between Czechoslovakia, Great Britain, and France, why should he hesitate about our assuming whatever responsibility the other countries may assume with respect to that matter?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has asked me to reply in his time, and therefore I am not violating the rules, I presume, in undertaking to reply to the question. If the Senator remains upon his feet, I suppose I can not be taken from mine.

Mr. President, of course I want religious freedom all over the earth; I want racial freedom all over the earth; and yet I am not one who goes so far as some others in the demand for racial equality. I do not know how far the Senator from Montana goes in that regard.

I want language protected all over the earth; and yet I want the English language and no other language spoken in the United States and no other language to be the language of the people. Does the Senator from Montana agree with me on that?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is quite apart from my question. My question is, Whether or not the Senator from New Mexico would like to have guaranties of any kind given to any country?

Mr. FALL. No. The Senator from Montana asked me specific questions, and I am answering the specific questions. I think that it is no part of the duty of the United States to say that the Serbian language shall not be spoken in some portion of Roumania, or that any other language shall not be spoken in some portion of Roumania. I do not think it is any part of the business of the United States to say, "If you do not allow perfect freedom of language within some part of Roumania or Czechoslovakia, the United States will see that you do do it, because we have written it into a treaty for you."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator has not yet answered whether he would like to have guaranties as between Czechoslovakia and any other country.

Mr. FALL. No; not with the United States obligated to carry them out.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Leave the United States out of the question. Would the Senator like to see guaranties between Czechoslovakia and any other country?

Mr. FALL. Guaranties of what? Does the Senator mean of racial equality?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of racial and religious freedom.

Mr. FALL. No.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well. The Senator from New Mexico, then, as I understand him, is perfectly willing to intrust such matters to the unrestrained discretion of the new States?

Mr. FALL. If I were not, I would place them under article 23 or under article 19 of the league of nations as powers over which the league of nations should exercise a mandate. I would not provide by treaty the specific provisions which they should write into their constitutions. I would leave them under the great league of nations which it is proposed shall regulate the world.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I merely desire to say that in a number of treaties which we have negotiated with other countries, adding territory to our own domain, we have stipulated that we would give certain rights and privileges to the people within such territory.

Mr. FALL. Certainly, Mr. President. When we acquired from France the Louisiana Purchase, when we acquired from Spain East and West Florida and New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Texas, we promised the utmost freedom to citizens of Spanish descent remaining within our boundaries. We bound ourselves, and we have kept our promises.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But we did promise them religious freedom, did we not?

Mr. FALL. Yes, sir; we promised them religious freedom and we also demanded it of Mexico; but you have sat still and allowed Mexico to adopt a constitution under which she denounces religious freedom and denounces her treaty with us; and yet you have recognized her.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. FALL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. Were he present I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore, I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "yea."



Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I announce the same pair and the same transfer that I have heretofore announced to-day and vote "yea."

Mr. DIAL (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). I desire to make the same announcement concerning my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], that I made on a former roll call. I ask that the announcement stand for the day.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). In the absence of my pair I withhold my vote on this amendment. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Owing to the absence of my pair, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to withdraw my vote, as I am paired with my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER], who is necessarily absent from the Chamber. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS. In view of the announcement of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] as to the action of his colleague I vote "nay."

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 53—as follows:

## YEAS—28.

Ball	Fall	La Pollette	Norris
Borah	Fernald	Lodge	Penrose
Brandeggee	France	McCormick	Phipps
Caldier	Frelinghuysen	McLean	Poin Dexter
Curtis	Harding	Moses	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	New	Warren
Elkins	Knox	Newberry	Watson

## NAYS—53.

Ashurst	Harrison	Nugent	Smoot
Bankhead	Henderson	Overman	Spencer
Beckham	Hitchcock	Owen	Swanson
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Pittman	Townsend
Colt	Kendrick	Pomerene	Trammell
Cummins	Kenyon	Ransdell	Underwood
Dial	Keyes	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Kirby	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Lenroot	Shields	Williams
Gay	McKellar	Simmons	Wilecott
Gerry	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	
Hale	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
Harris	Nelson	Smith, Md.	

## NOT VOTING—15.

Culbertson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Stanley
Gore	King	Reed	Sterling
Gronna	McCumber	Sherman	Sutherland
Johnson, Calif.	Martin	Smith, S. C.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The SECRETARY. Amendments Nos. 11 and 12, reserved, will be found on page 129, in the same paragraph, subdivision 2, of the annex to article 88.

On line 3 of subdivision 2, the committee proposes to strike out the words "the United States of America," and the comma following; and, on the next line, after the word "Allied," it proposes to strike out the words "and Associated."

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, under the consent agreement entered into a few moments ago, six amendments, included in which were the two now before the Senate, were reserved for a possible yea-and-nay vote.

I desire to say now that amendment 16 covers the provisions of a treaty with Poland similar to that which was voted on under amendment 9, with reference to Czechoslovakia, so that I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote upon amendment 16. I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on amendment 17 and amendment 23. One relates to a plebiscite and governing commission in East Prussia, and the other relates to the same character of a government in Rosenberg and Marienburg, and certain other burghs or territories, unknown, I may say, to myself. In the case of the amendments before the Senate—that is, 11 and 12—which relate to the governing commission for the territory known as Upper Silesia, one roll call is sufficient to cover both of the amendments. The first amendment simply provides that the international commission for Upper Silesia

shall not be constituted with one representative from the United States of America. I am going to read the provision to which amendment 12 applies:

It—

Referring to this district—

shall be occupied by troops belonging to the Allied and Associated Powers, and the German Government undertakes to give facilities for the transference of these troops to Upper Silesia.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator submit to a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Was any information placed before the Foreign Relations Committee as to the number of troops that would be required to police this district?

Mr. FALL. None whatever.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. How long is it expected that the troops will have to remain there?

Mr. FALL. At least 18 months, and then for an indefinite length of time; that is, until, in the opinion of the governing commission, Poland and Prussia are so quiet that the necessity for troops no longer exists. Otherwise it is indefinite.

Mr. LODGE. Is this where the two regiments have just been sent?

Mr. FALL. It is.

Mr. LODGE. We have just sent two regiments to Upper Silesia.

Mr. FALL. Already, preceded by Hilaire's army, which, however, has gone over into Poland, and is holding down Poland while Poland is acquiring certain oil and coal lands from Ukraina. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] asks who is holding down Ukraina. I do not know. It is rather mixed up; but Hilaire's army is holding down Poland while the Polish Army is occupied in getting a portion of Ukraina, so that our troops are engaged in very beneficial work, I suppose. It is not necessary to comment.

This commission has unlimited governmental powers. The district is at the present time in confusion. There have been conflicts between Germans and Poles—whether between the armies of the respective governments or not is doubtful, but certainly between the citizens of the two countries—respecting the coal mines in particular, which have long been producing very large amounts of coal for the use of Prussia. Conflicts are going on now, just as they are going on in the great free city of Danzig, which the Senate will not want to vote on, I presume, by a separate yea-and-nay vote; but this is one of the questions upon which we should have the yeas and nays. We should have an expression of sentiment, it seems to me, by each of the Senators as to whether he proposes to vote for the adoption of a treaty under the terms of which we not only will maintain a governing commission in Upper Silesia, but under the terms of which the direct provision is that we shall furnish troops to occupy that area.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, as has been stated by the Senator from New Mexico, this section of the treaty provides expressly that the United States shall occupy certain portions of the territory of Upper Silesia by American troops.

The result of a policy of the kind that is provided for in this section of the treaty—the interposition of the military forces of the United States in the interior of Europe for the purpose of enforcing by military action the obligations assumed by the United States—is illustrated by an incident that occurred in Siberia a few days ago, where we have troops of the United States. One of the inevitable characteristics of the administration of such duties as are provided by this section of the treaty is that we have a comparatively small number of troops. We have duties, and we have troops for the purpose of enforcing them by military action, and it may be assumed that the number of troops we will have in Upper Silesia will not be sufficient to protect themselves against the possible and very probable antagonism that the decision of disputed questions between hostile factions and races will undoubtedly create. They are going into a fight without the possibility of being able to see it through with dignity and honor either to themselves or to the Nation which they represent.

We have a few thousand men in Siberia for the purpose of enforcing our obligations there, and in the few moments that I have at my disposal I want to read an incident which occurred, which is very likely to be repeated at any one of these various places in Europe where we are assuming obligations and proposing to send troops, either under the express provisions of the treaty, as in this case, or under the necessary implications of the treaty where it is not expressly provided for.



A press dispatch from Vladivostok, dated Friday, September 19, states as follows:

#### ARRESTED BY COSSACKS.

The two Americans, in uniform and on official business, went to Iman, a town 170 miles north of this city, on the section of the railroad guarded by Chinese troops, passports being unnecessary, by agreement between the Allies. While they were at a hotel there a detachment of Cossacks entered and arrested the Americans, claiming they were not provided with identification papers. Capt. Johns managed to escape, and, catching a moving train, went to Spasske, where he reported to the American officer in command. A detachment of 150 Americans from the Twenty-seventh Regiment at once entrained and went to Iman to effect Sperling's release, and on arriving there took three Cossacks as hostages.

#### JAPANESE DEFENDS COSSACKS.

They found Gen. Kalmikoff's men intrenched near the station and were prepared to use force against them when a Japanese major interceded for the Cossacks, stating, it is alleged, that in the event of hostilities between the Americans and Cossacks the Japanese troops at Iman would side with the latter.

#### AMERICAN FLOGGED.

A preliminary investigation of the incident shows, it is said, that Sperling was flogged, a punishment that is usually meted out to a recalcitrant Cossack.

The parties referred to were Capt. L. P. Johns, an officer of the American Army in Siberia, and Corp. Sperling, a noncommissioned officer of the American forces, who were engaged in an attempt to perform these duties in a country with which we are at peace, supported by an insignificant force which is perfectly helpless there in case antagonisms are created. Under those circumstances this indignity to the uniform of the United States and to the people of the United States was perpetrated, and the United States is helpless to vindicate its honor. It is the inevitable result of this sort of inefficient meddling with governmental business in distant parts of the world which the Senator from New Mexico seeks to relieve us of in this series of amendments.

The five principal allied and associated powers were to settle the Dalmatian boundary; and the result of the performance of that duty on the part of the principal allied and associated powers was that Japan, one of the principal allied powers, went home, and has paid no attention whatever to it. I do not blame Japan for doing so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I am not in favor of the United States assuming any obligation to send or maintain troops anywhere. I am not in favor of the United States assuming the obligation that is involved in this article that is proposed to be amended. But, Mr. President, it is no more necessary to amend this article to relieve the United States from that obligation than it is necessary to amend article 10 of the covenant of the league of nations, and there is no proposal to amend article 10. It is proposed to relieve the United States from the obligation imposed by article 10 by reservation, and the United States can be just as readily relieved of the obligation under this article as it can be relieved of the obligation under article 10.

I shall not vote for the treaty at all, Mr. President, unless the United States is relieved of the obligation to employ the military and naval forces of the United States for any purpose, and that includes this purpose, and a reservation of that kind will fully protect and relieve us of the obligation that is imposed under this article. It is plain to everybody, I think, that this treaty can not be ratified unless a reservation is adopted that will relieve the United States of just such obligations as this, but it is not necessary, Mr. President, to amend the treaty and send it back to the peace conference to accomplish that object.

Because that object can be fully accomplished by a reservation instead of an amendment, I am opposed to this amendment, but shall favor a reservation that will fully relieve the United States of the obligation imposed by this article.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I should like to get the Senator's opinion on the clause in the annex which reads:

It shall be within the competence of the commission to interpret the powers hereby conferred upon it and to determine to what extent it shall exercise them.

And then, again:

The commission will maintain order with the help of the troops which will be at its disposal.

If we ratify this treaty, do we not lose all control of the troops we have placed under that commission?

Mr. LENROOT. The answer is that when the treaty is ratified we will have no troops there. The moment the treaty is ratified, with the reservation we propose to adopt, our troops will be withdrawn, unless Congress expressly authorizes their maintenance.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If we have troops there, how can we get them out?

Mr. LENROOT. Because those troops, unless the President violates his oath of office, with that reservation can not be lawfully kept there for a single hour.

Mr. MOSES. But suppose the President declines to deposit the ratification of the treaty, as has been threatened through the newspapers?

Mr. LENROOT. If the President declines to deposit the ratification of the treaty, you can make all the amendments to this treaty that you choose, and they will not be worth the snap of your finger.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the eleventh and twelfth amendments in subdivision 2.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, do I understand that this vote is to cover both amendments 11 and 12?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, amendments 11 and 12 in subdivision 2 of the annex to article 88, on page 129, will be submitted at a single vote. The yeas and nays are demanded. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I make the same transfer of my pair as on the previous vote and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as heretofore and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], who was compelled to leave the Chamber. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would on these two amendments vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). On this question my general pair the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is released and can be otherwise paired.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING. I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]; and

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GRONNA. I transfer my pair with my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 46, as follows:

#### YEAS—31.

Ball	Fernald	La Follette	Penrose
Borah	France	Lodge	Phipps
Brandegee	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Poinexter
Calder	Gronna	McLean	Sterling
Cummins	Harding	Moses	Townsend
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	New	Wadsworth
Elkins	Kenyon	Newberry	Watson
Fall	Knox	Norris	

#### NAYS—46.

Ashurst	Harrison	Nugent	Smoot
Bankhead	Henderson	Overman	Spencer
Beckham	Hitchcock	Owen	Stanley
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Pittman	Trammell
Colt	Kendrick	Pomerene	Underwood
Dial	Kirby	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Lenroot	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	McKellar	Sheppard	Williams
Gerry	McNary	Simmons	Wolcott
Hale	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	
Harris	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	

#### NOT VOTING—19.

Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Smith S. C.
Dillingham	Keyes	Reed	Sutherland
Edge	King	Sherman	Thomas
Gore	McCumber	Shields	Warren
Johnson, Calif.	Martin	Smith, Md.	

So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, under the agreement which was arrived at, all the remaining amendments to be voted on, as



I understand the agreement to be, may now be voted on by viva voce in one vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand that to be the case, but can the Senator recall what amendments still remain to be acted upon?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. Amendments 16, 17, and 23.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is my recollection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] asks unanimous consent that amendments 16, 17, and 23 be voted upon together. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I would like to suggest, before we adjourn, that I think the proceedings this afternoon have undoubtedly convinced any doubting Thomas that there is no intention to filibuster upon the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate, as in legislative session, adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, October 3, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, October 2, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, creator, upholder and sustainer of all, we humbly bow in Thy presence and acknowledge with gratitude our indebtedness to Thee for all things; and we humbly pray that by the nobility of our thought and rectitude of our behavior, we may acknowledge Thy goodness and wonderful works to the children of men, this day. In the spirit of the Lord Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWNING was granted leave of absence for three days, on account of important business.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the form of resolutions of the Society of Sons of the Revolution of the State of California upon the subject of Bolshevism and other matters of importance.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing resolutions adopted by the Sons of the Revolution of California on Bolshevism and kindred subjects. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the subject of those things?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. OSBORNE. Two things. One is the character of foreign immigration, and the other is on the subject of Bolshevism, both very pertinent to the time and without any partisan bias.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the article that the gentleman attempts to put in the Record cry down Bolshevism?

Mr. OSBORNE. Well, it is not in favor of Bolshevism.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, unless it denounces it in unmistakable terms, I shall object. The time has come when we should quit monkeying with that subject. I shall object.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman can not qualify his objection in that way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not object conditionally. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the poem which was put in yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] on a subject with which, in my judgment, it had no connection at all, until I can see the article I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to expend certain sums appropriated for the support of the Army for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1919, and June 30, 1920, at Camp A. A. Humphreys, Va.

### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege respecting the integrity of the proceedings of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts rises to a question of privilege.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 30, after the conclusion of the consideration of the cold-storage bill, so called, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], on page 6165 of the Record, secured unanimous consent for all gentlemen in the House to have three legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the cold-storage bill, and in the Record yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] extended his remarks upon the cold storage, presumably, by putting in a dozen or so lines in which the words "cold-storage bill" appear once, and then putting in a poem of some 10 or 12 stanzas entitled "Our Own—A Cry Across the Atlantic," by Israel Zangwill. It is a very eloquent poem, and I presume perhaps that the view of the gentleman from New York was that he was putting this poem in cold storage by having it inserted in the Record [laughter], and that, therefore, it was a proper insertion under the consent secured by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Now, the Record is being rather taxed to its capacity, and the patience of the many readers of it, I think, is being somewhat burdened by extensions of remarks, speeches, and articles that are caused to be put in it by a jurisdiction other than the House. But it is just such insertions as these, I think, that make the Record appear to be a sort of semicomic daily magazine. It is clearly not within the purview of the consent which was granted to print a poem of that length in the Record, and it has nothing to do with the subject of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the poem about—cold storage?

Mr. WALSH. No; the poem is about—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Read it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. It is about a certain race of people—

Mr. ASHBROOK. Irish? [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. And the suffering that they have encountered during the ages, and so forth, and the blood that courses through their veins.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it the Irish? [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. No; it is not the Irish. But, Mr. Speaker, in view of the consent that was granted and in view of what appears to me to be a plain infraction of the rules of the House in making this extension, I move that the poem in the Record of October 1 entitled "Our Own—A Cry Across the Atlantic," by Israel Zangwill, which was inserted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL], be stricken from the Record.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve that until my colleague gets into the House?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. I wanted to offer it on the moment, but action can be deferred until the gentleman from New York is present.

### DUTY ON MAGNESITE ORE.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5218.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5218. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] will resume the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5218, with Mr. ANDERSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5218, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5218) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of magnesite ores and manufactures thereof in the United States.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, magnesite is a mineral that is indispensable in the manufacture of steel. Before the war, practically the entire supply of this mineral came from Austria.